

15, 1950, in the grade of second Lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduate, and subject to physical qualification:

Donald J. Opitz.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are again assembling in this Chamber as colleagues and coworkers engaged in a high and holy mission and conscious of facing tremendous tasks and responsibilities.

Humbly we are invoking Thy blessing, one in our need and longing, beseeching Thee that we may have the guiding and interpreting light of Thy spirit.

Grant that we may be calm and courageous as we find ourselves challenged by many difficult national and international problems.

May we seek to build a social order in which righteousness reigns supremely and love is the law of life.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 21, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3176. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule XI (2) (c), I call up House Resolution 348 which has remained in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 139]

Allen, Ill.	Bolton, Md.	Burdick
Bailey	Bonner	Burton
Battle	Boykin	Byrne, N. Y.

Carlyle	Havener	Quinn
Case, N. J.	Hébert	Rains
Case, S. Dak.	Hedrick	Reed, Ill.
Cavalcante	Heffernan	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Heller	Rhodes
Chelf	Hope	Ribicoff
Chesney	Jacobs	Riehlman
Chiperfield	James	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Javits	Sabath
Corbett	Jenkins	Sadowski
Coudert	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Crosser	Jones, N. O.	Scott,
Davenport	Judd	Hugh D., Jr.
Davies, N. Y.	Kelley, Pa.	Secret
DeGraffenried	Kennedy	Shelley
Doughton	Keogh	Sims
Douglas	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Engle, Calif.	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Ohio
Fisher	Lodge	Staggers
Fulton	Macy	Steed
Gilmer	Martin, Iowa	Wagner
Gorski	Miles	Walsh
Grant	Morrison	Whitaker
Gwinn	Morton	White, Calif.
Hale	Murphy	Wickersham
Hall,	Nixon	Widnall
Leonard W.	Norton	Wolcott
Harden	Pace	Woodhouse
Hardy	Powell	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 348).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take up the time of the House to discuss this rule, because I think the support of it is virtually unanimous.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to go on record in favor of the bill which is now pending on the floor and in particular that part of it which authorizes the erection of a neuropsychiatric hospital of

1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla., and a general medical hospital of 100 beds at Tallahassee, Fla.

As you know, the State of Florida is rather uniquely located. It is the only State in the Union with water on three sides. The result of this location, while having many advantages, nevertheless has some disadvantages and one of those is the disadvantage to the veteran who needs and is seeking medical attention. In other words, if the veteran cannot find the attention which he needs in his State, he can ordinarily go a few miles across into another State. Such is not the case in Florida. In many instances veterans have to travel over 400 miles to receive any medical attention whatsoever. There are at the present time almost 2,000 veterans who are resided in the State of Florida but who have had to go into another State in order to receive attention.

Due to the tremendous influx of veterans during the winter months to our State, the few Veterans' Administration facilities during those winter months are tremendously overtaxed. It means that the local veterans, in many instances, have to be refused medical attention and care because of the influx of transient veterans. The situation is indeed deplorable. There are today approximately 800 Florida veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric disorders. They have been hospitalized in seven hospitals in five Southern States. For the families of those veterans to be able to visit them they had to travel oftentimes as much as 1,500 miles, which entailed at least a 2-day trip.

In our State there is today only one State institution caring for mental cases. It was built to take care of 300 patients, but at the present time is caring for a little over 4,500 patients, and it has a long waiting list of veterans and non-veterans awaiting admission. There are many veterans that are at the moment in jail, having to be confined there for the safety of the area, awaiting admission to some mental hospital.

The acuteness of this situation was spotlighted when at a recent meeting of the county judges of the State of Florida they went on record with a statement that the Congress and the Veterans' Administration should immediately provide hospital facilities in the State for mentally ill war veterans.

Florida is the fastest growing State in the South. The census now being taken, I feel confident, will more than substantiate that statement. The national average for hospital beds for veterans is 1 bed for every 129 veterans; the Florida average at the moment is 1 bed for every 237 veterans, and this does not take into account the winter nonresidential veterans which we have flooding into the State every year.

Certainly there is a grave and urgent need for the adoption of this legislation by the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] such time as he may desire.

K. O. CUT FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, "Do we have to go without regular mail service so that the Government may have more 'give-away' money for Europe?"

That is a typical reaction of the average American citizen after the drastic cut in postal services was announced to an unsuspecting public.

With one lightning thrust the morale of loyal and hard-working postal employees has been knocked down to an all-time low. Disabled vets, who took and passed the civil-service exams for clerk-carrier and have been working as "temps" and "subs" in the expectation that they would get permanent work sooner or later, now find themselves the victims of a sneak freeze-out with the prospect of no work at all.

Why? Why?

Because, in the face of a deficit, the House Appropriations Committee cut the funds and put the squeeze on post-office service. On the other hand, the Senate has failed to act on the House-approved rate-increase bill expected to add \$131,000,000 in revenues, a measure which would have reduced the deficit and saved the country from a stab-in-the-back slash of a primary function of Government.

The Nation is expanding, both in its population and its communications. Millions of veterans, social-security recipients, and others depend upon the mail for their subsistence checks. Business and the Government itself are leaning more heavily on delivery by our postal system. The need is for more mail service, not less. In view of these facts, it does not make sense to cut post-office manpower and expect the Department to carry an increasing burden with decreasing service.

Slowing down operations is a step backward. It will delay business, cause hardship in many cases, and aggravate the anxiety of those who depend upon prompt delivery of mail from their loved ones in distant places.

Householders and business folk alike protest against this crippling economy.

This age of progress is no time to shove our postal service back into the past.

A sincere effort at economy, and one that would not penalize either the postal workers or the community at large, would lift the lid from the mystery of railroad, air line, and steamship line subsidies. There they would find many cases where it costs dollars to deliver one letter, with the blame for such costs passed on to the mail service as a whole.

The ordinary 3-cent letter pays its way. It should not and cannot be called upon to carry the burden of the chiselers or the industries which are subsidized at the expense of our Post Office Department.

Let us get this shell game out into the open.

If steamship lines, air lines, and railroads must be subsidized by the Government in the interests of our national economy or security, we must recognize the problem as such. It is manifestly unfair to saddle the post office with these

hidden costs and then call upon postal workers and the public to make sacrifices so that the secret of subsidies may be kept secret.

The American people want this strangulation order canceled, and soon.

Give the Post Office Department enough money in one way or another so that it can do the job we expect it to do.

Restore 1950 service to the public, save post office employee morale, and get on with the business of progress again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5965, with Mr. STRIGLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Every Member of the House knows what is in it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill directs the Veterans' Administration to proceed with the construction of approximately 16,000 additional beds previously approved by the President and authorization for which was dropped from the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950.

Each one of the provisions enumerated in the bill was approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Bureau of the Budget after extensive study and recommendation by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on August 23, 1949, and is endorsed and actively supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and American Veterans of World War II.

In Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950, the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses eliminated the rescission of \$237,000,000 and thus provided for contract authority in that amount to begin the construction of these 16,000 beds. The House Committee on Appropriations, in commenting on this subject, stated that it was of the opinion that this reduction of program originated in the Bureau of the Budget and perhaps was not thoroughly considered.

This entire subject was thoroughly explored in extensive hearings conducted by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate and, in addition, was studied by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

Passage of this bill will do much to relieve a real need, as shown by surveys conducted by service organizations.

I read from the report of the Senate hearings.

In response to questions, General Gray indicated that in his opinion determination as to the number of hospital beds and facilities is the responsibility of the Congress, and that the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration is to indicate what types of facilities are needed and to recommend where such needed facilities should be located.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we have about 25,000 veterans now needing hospitalization.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. As of the end of February 1950, there was a waiting list of 25,707 disabled veterans seeking hospitalization in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Of these, 34 were service-connected. However, many of the 25,663 who are now designated as nonservice-connected will later establish the service-connection of their disabilities.

When the reduction is made in the Army and Navy hospitals, there will be no place for the disabled veterans to go, if this hospital program is not continued. In my mind it is a very cruel thing to prevent men who have fought for us and who were injured for us from having hospitalization. The country is thoroughly in favor of hospitalizing these veterans. We must also bear in mind the fact that the peak of hospitalization for World War I will not be reached until 1955, when it is expected there will be 59,700 patients of this war in Veterans' Administration hospitals. For World War II, the peak will be reached in 1975, at which time there should be 186,000 disabled veteran patients of that war alone.

Some of the veterans' hospitals have been closed. There have been some deaths after the men were sent home. The men are not receiving proper treatment. It would be a very cruel thing not to pass this legislation. The authorization for the building of these hospitals goes back to 1931. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress authorized it. The Appropriations Committee and the last Congress appropriated the money. The Appropriations Committee in this Congress appropriated the money, so there will be no additional appropriation needed in addition to that which has already been made.

There never has been a more appropriate time for the consideration of this bill than that is before us today.

Upon making inquiry at the Veterans' Administration this morning, I find that because of lack of space in the VA hospitals, 1,888 disabled veterans are hospitalized in Army hospitals and 2,572 are

in Navy hospitals, a total of 4,460 disabled veterans that the Veterans' Administration for one reason or another is unable to care for in their own facilities.

On the 15th of February the Secretary of Defense announced the imminent closing of a number of Army and Navy hospitals and medical facilities and the reduction of others. This, he has ordered, with a view toward economy, although it is exceedingly difficult to see where any money will be saved by such a drastic action.

It does not strain the imagination to foretell what will happen to many of the 4,460 disabled veterans now receiving medical care in these service hospitals when the retrenchment program of the Department of Defense goes into effect. They will be shunted about, some placed in civilian hospitals already overcrowded, and in many instances men and women who really require additional care and treatment will be discharged because of the lack of beds.

Decidedly, this is no time to curtail our ability to give proper medical care to disabled veterans. We all believe in real economy in the operation of our Government, and we will support any measure that will save money for the taxpayers. However, as I pointed out to this House last Friday in speaking upon this subject, it certainly is not economy to close down Army and Navy hospitals and Veterans' Administration hospitals all over the country and then 6 months or a year later have to reopen these hospitals. Anybody who has followed the course of the closing of service hospitals or Veterans' Administration hospitals knows there is a tremendous loss of equipment involved. Expensive hospital equipment is sold for almost nothing, or given away. Then when of necessity the hospitals must be reopened expensive equipment must again be bought.

I link this bill with the Department of Defense proposed hospital reduction because I do not believe you can separate consideration of the two matters. Any change in the existing hospital bed situation affects the Veterans' Administration whether it is governmental or civilian.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Senate has repeatedly taken cognizance of the necessity of going ahead with the hospital-building program as recommended. Authorization of \$237,000,000 for the projects enumerated in this bill has been included in the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950. The need for the hospitals has been well established and despite the action of the President through his Bureau of the Budget in cutting down these facilities we should in no uncertain manner tell him the desire of Congress in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5965, a bill to provide for the construction of Veteran's hospitals. The legislation under discussion does not call for an addi-

tional appropriation. The money has been authorized and the construction authorization has already been established.

By the provisions of this bill the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is directed to construct additional facilities to provide approximately 16,000 additional hospital beds which were previously approved by the President, but was dropped in the budget estimate for the fiscal year 1950 as presented to the Congress by the President to reduce the size of certain hospital projects.

More than 20 States would be recognized in this hospital construction program. A 500-bed general medical and surgical hospital at Chattanooga, Tenn., and a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Memphis, Tenn., have already been approved for construction, and are greatly needed.

The closing of Army hospitals, and orders to vacate in part the Veterans' Administration hospital construction program will have a disastrous effect on the Nation's obligation to care for its disabled veterans. It is my duty as a Member of Congress to take the necessary steps and assume the responsibility as an elected Representative to assist in carrying out the obligations of the Government to the disabled veterans of this country.

The situation is critical, and this matter needs immediate action. A huge number of World War II veterans make the enlargement of existing facilities essential. The Executive order reducing veterans' hospital building by 16,000 beds deprives thousands of needy veterans of essential medical care. Many of these veterans are service-connected and disabled. Some are not service-connected, but are emergency cases; others do not have the money to get medical assistance elsewhere although they served our country in time of need with great honor, and rendered a valuable service in defense of this country.

The recent Army reduction of some 10,000 beds in service hospitals has brought about a critical condition because many of these beds were under contract for the use of Veterans' Administration patients.

Service to the sick and wounded is a national problem. Seriously ill patients are moved out of the hospitals, many of whom are sent home to die. Many fine American boys are placed in jail because the State hospitals and mental hospitals are not available because of lack of facilities. Many of these veterans are now feeling the effect of their wartime experiences and are becoming mental patients with no adequate facilities to take care of them.

Within a few years' time the heavy burden of the medical requirements for veterans of all wars will reach a heavy load, and unless we take steps now to provide the necessary legislation we may not have the necessary hospitals in the future to take care of the veterans in all sections of our country. The DAV, American Legion, VFW, and AMVETS, and ladies auxiliaries have studied this question very seriously, and have gone

on record in favor of restoring the 16,000 bed construction program.

I testified 2 years ago before the subcommittee in the Senate handling this legislation because it occurred to me at that time that the proposed legislation was needed. The situation has become more acute.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I have received many communications from veterans throughout the entire Nation who desire hospitalization. Long waiting lists continue to increase in number in most of the States of this country. In the First Congressional District of Tennessee there are many who need hospitalization, but the veterans' facilities are not sufficient to take care of many worthy cases. Many veterans are released from the hospitals before they are permanently cured, or before their condition has reached a point to justify their release from the hospital. In many cases this is necessary in order to make a bed available for some other deserving veteran who is in need of medical care.

There are many old veterans of the Spanish-American War, and World War I, who are not getting into VA hospitals under the new order, many of whom are in great need of care. Some of these veterans who are in the institutions are being cast out to make room for others. The war for many of these veterans and their families is not over. A visit to our hospitals to look upon the expressions on the faces of thousands of young men who at one time were full of youth and hope is convincing evidence of our responsibility as a Nation to the returned veterans and their families.

Our Government and the people of this country are called upon annually to contribute millions of dollars to fight the spread of tuberculosis, but yet when there are not sufficient hospitals to take care of veterans affected with tuberculosis our Government then becomes an agency for the spread of that disease. In many cases the veteran is compelled to live with his family and circulate among his friends and thus continue to spread this dreadful disease. The situation is such that the Veterans' Administration should be given the encouragement to go out and get necessary personnel consisting of fine doctors, nurses, and technicians to insure reasonable care to the veterans of this country.

It is a real pleasure to support this much-needed legislation. In voting for this legislation it is my belief that I am promoting the general welfare of our Nation and helping to bring about in a realistic way the obligation of this Government to the Veterans of all wars who have worn the uniform with honor and discharged their duty on the battlefields of the world when the freedom of this country has been placed in jeopardy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, since this Congress seems to be intent on spending this additional money I had

rather it be spent on hospital facilities than on a great many of the things it is being spent for. I wish, however, to call the attention of the House to a few figures, very pertinent in my estimation. This morning I called Dr. Press, of the Veterans' Administration, and asked him this question: "How many beds do you have available in your Veterans' Administration hospital facilities that you cannot use because of failure to get medical personnel with which to staff them?" His answer was that on February 28 last there were 3,712 beds available except for the staffing of those beds. Some other figures that I think should be called to your attention is that on February 28, 98,803 veterans were hospitalized. Of this number 32,287 were hospitalized for service-connected disability and 65,149 for non-service-connected disability.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to build 16,000 additional beds, we should insist that the beds now available be utilized. I know it probably is very unpopular for me to question the immediate unanimous passage of this bill. I have heard a great many Members talk about the number of veterans in their districts who are now languishing in the county jail. The answer to the jail question is simply this, in almost every instance those veterans who are incarcerated in county jails are mental cases. The service-connected nature of the case has not been established. I have a bill, H. R. 7534, pending before the committee which would grant automatic service connection to those mental cases and would automatically place them in Veterans' Administration hospital facilities with preference over non-service-connected cases. That is the answer to your jail-load question.

Before closing I wish to emphasize that we should in all wisdom, in the name of common sense, insist that these 3,712 beds be utilized before we build additional facilities. This bill should be amended in such way as to require the Veterans' Administration to utilize all the beds that are now at its disposal, in addition to all the facilities that can be made available to it by the armed services, before any new hospitals are built.

No one on this floor today is more interested than I am in seeing to it that all deserving veterans have provided for them adequate hospital facilities; however, I am not willing to vote for a measure calling for the construction of 16,000 new beds until I am assured that currently available facilities are utilized to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield himself 1 minute that I may ask him a question?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I take 1 minute in order to answer the question of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As I understand, this bill is for the 16,000 beds that were canceled by the Budget Bureau and the President. What assurance can the gentleman give the Members of the House that the President and the Budget Bureau will not again cancel

the authorization which is passed by the Congress?

Mr. RANKIN. If it becomes law, it is mandatory; it is a directive.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman thinks this is mandatory law and that the other was not mandatory.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I take this minute for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee one or two questions.

Has there been taken into consideration the most recent veteran-bed-requirement census in the West, specifically in California, Oregon, and those Western States?

Mr. RANKIN. We have not caused any census to be taken, I may say to the gentleman from California, but we do provide for additional beds in those States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the time the bill was under consideration, was it part of the committee's consideration that all available facilities were to be used by the Veterans' Administration that had been surveyed out by the military forces?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the answer of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. We found that a great many of those hospitals were firetraps and some of them were spread over such vast areas they were not suitable for veterans' hospitals.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the chairman one additional question? Was that answer responsive to the Long Beach and Corona permanent hospitals?

Mr. RANKIN. Many of those questions arose and that was the reply of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I appear in support of H. R. 5965. I have had some experience with this problem, particularly in my district which I think stands as a good example as to the need Nation-wide.

I come from a metropolitan area in the northwest corner of the State of Ohio which includes the city of Toledo, a city in excess of 300,000 population. In that area we have over 100,000 veterans, yet there is not a veterans' facility or a hospital anywhere nearer than the city of Cleveland, which is some 120 miles away.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that under the original program the hospital for the city of Toledo was approved and all of the factors, including the availability of medical personnel was looked into, as well as proximity to a medical school. We are very close to the University of Michigan, about 25 to 30 miles away. Under the original program, the land had all been acquired, the working plans for the hospital were completed and everything was laid out

for the excavators to begin, when the program was stopped. I believe this same condition can apply in other sections of the country and in other hospitals provided for by this bill. That expenditure, in my opinion, in itself, if the program is not completed would be a waste of funds that the Government has already expended.

Several million dollars, so I am told by the Veterans' Administration, have already been expended on this program for acquisition of land and the preparation of working plans for the building of these hospitals. That will be money down the sink if this bill is not passed. Every indication points to the passage of this bill in all justice to our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to point out that at the present time there are 1,888 disabled veterans hospitalized in Army hospitals. There are 2,572 disabled veterans in Navy hospitals, making a total of 4,460 veterans that the Veterans' Administration for one reason or another is unable to care for in their own facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The thing that has me puzzled is why they dismantled all of these Army and Navy hospitals and now we are called upon to build veterans hospitals. If the gentleman can explain that I would appreciate it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that he is not the only one on the floor of this House that is puzzled by that action. I am taking this time to ask the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member of the committee concerning bids to be submitted in the future, which call for the building of these hospitals, and I would like to get this information in the Record.

The Chicago, Ill., general medical and surgical hospital. Construction on that hospital has been started. There is reduction of 500 beds from the original proposal of 1,000 beds.

The Cincinnati, Ohio, hospital has been reduced from 750 beds to 500 beds.

The Cleveland, Ohio, general medical and surgical hospital has been reduced from 1,000 beds to 500 beds. Bids will be advertised for this hospital on June 30.

The neuropsychiatric hospital at Cleveland, Ohio, has been reduced from 1,250 beds to 1,000 beds, bids to be received in the spring of 1952 for this hospital.

The Louisville, Ky., general medical and surgical hospital has been reduced from 750 to 500 beds, which hospital is now under construction.

The Kansas City general medical and surgical hospital has been reduced from 750 beds to 500 beds, which hospital is now under construction.

The Oklahoma City hospital has been reduced from 1,000 beds to 500 beds. Bids will be advertised for on May 30.

The Philadelphia hospital had been reduced from 1,000 beds to 500 beds, and is now under construction.

The Pittsburgh, Pa., general medical and surgical hospital has been reduced from 1,200 beds to 750 beds, and bids were advertised for on April 20.

The neuropsychiatric hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa., has been reduced 250 beds from 1,250 to 1,000 beds, which hospital is now under construction.

The St. Louis, Mo., general medical and surgical hospital has been reduced 500 beds, and bids were advertised for on May 15.

The Syracuse, N. Y., hospital has been reduced 500 beds, and the contract has been awarded. The local hospital in Washington, D. C., will be advertised for this summer or fall.

My question is this: This provides for a total of 7,250 beds. Are these 7,250 beds to be deducted from the 16,000 beds requested for under this bill, or is that in addition?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee inform the House in what particular the 7,250 beds will not be reduced under the appropriation in this particular bill for 16,000 beds?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not have that information at my fingertips. The gentleman was on the committee and heard the testimony.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not believe that the gentleman from New York ever heard any testimony in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs relative to this particular question. There was some testimony taken in the other body.

I do not yield to anyone in my desire to adequately care for our disabled veterans. As I stated heretofore several new hospitals are under construction—bids on others have been received—and still others will be open for bids in the near future. What I am tremendously concerned about is the necessity for immediate care of veterans on the waiting lists of the various hospitals. We have had information in the past few weeks that several Army and Navy hospitals are to be abandoned—hospitals built at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers and hospitals which were designed and operated to give the finest of medical service to members of our armed forces. Most of these hospitals are only a few years old and are good for many years to come, according to the information I receive. I am also concerned about the staffing of the hospitals. My information is that other than the proposals for new hospitals as listed by the Veterans' Administration—additional beds could not be properly and adequately cared for. It does not make sense, at least to me, to build any additional beds unless proper medical service, including doctors, nurses, attendants, and so forth, can be provided. The Administrator himself says, and I quote:

To continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding in terms of

beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients.

In some instances the cut-back is due to the fact that the President did approve an increase in the size of another hospital provided for the same area.

In my humble opinion, if the abandoned Army and Navy hospitals will be taken over by the Veterans' Administration where feasible and can be utilized—as they can—the veterans will have immediate hospitalization instead of having to wait months and years before new veterans hospitals are built. It will also result in the savings of millions and millions of dollars without decreasing the efficiency and sympathetic understanding and care of our disabled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, of course I shall support this bill, as just about everybody else here will. But I want to tell the Committee one thing about the hospital situation in this country as it affects the military. The Department of Defense has cut back five hospitals or ordered them to be cut back beginning June 1. In these military hospitals there are some 3,000 veterans' beds authorized for the next fiscal year. The Veterans' Administration asked the military to give them 5,300 beds. They were cut down to 3,000, I believe. The Veterans' Administration is 2½ years behind in their program of construction. If the Veterans' Administration is not compelled to use these hospitals the veterans of this country will be out in the cold for 2½ years. It is the worst situation I have seen in the 10 years I have been in Congress.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman see any reason why the Veterans' Administration should not take over these Army and Navy hospitals?

Mr. RIVERS. There is no reason under the sun. We are here concerned with the taxpayers' money, remember you that. The veterans are getting the finest service in the world in the Army and Navy hospitals, and you know that it is cheaper than the Veterans' Administration can give it to them. The veterans have a right to be in these hospitals. In the early day of the Veterans' Administration they contributed \$1,000,000,000 to the hospitals. They have a right to be in these hospitals. When we arbitrarily close the doors in the faces of these veterans it just is not humanity. There is no rhyme or reason to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like very much to, but there are a great many requests for time.

Mr. RIVERS. But the gentlewoman has not given me any time yet.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say that the hospital treatment and service in the Veterans' Administration is the finest in the country and the finest in the world. The Members should remember the year 1922 when the veterans' hospitals were closed and the men were put out in the streets and many of them died while being transferred to other hospitals. That is one reason why I accepted the appointment as the personal representative of the President in case of disabled veterans, a task which took me to hospitals all over the United States to ascertain whether or not the disabled veterans were receiving adequate treatment. At that time I found the care was inadequate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I want at a later and more opportune time to say something about the general administration of the veterans regime because I have had considerable experience with the Veterans' Administration. At this time I will confine myself to the hospital which is in Minneapolis, Minn., at Fort Snelling. There have been a number of occasions when I have had to go out there in behalf of veterans who were being thrown out of the hospitals, deliberately thrown out, or removed if you like that word better. Minnesota is a very long State and there are great distances which must be traveled. I expect that later in the debate the gentlemen representing the northern section of Minnesota will present the problems up there. I want to add my support to those who are in favor of this bill. I must support this bill as the result of the experience which, as I have just said, I have had. Minnesota is well represented in the medical field. We have one of the best medical universities in the United States at the University of Minnesota adjoining Fort Snelling. In addition to that as we all know we have the Mayo Institute at Rochester, Minn. Now here is the development concerning which I object and it is because of this that I am throwing my support in favor of this bill. I have had to go out on behalf of veterans who were being removed from the hospitals to make room for surgery cases. I can take two men to Dr. Rose, hospital manager, at Fort Snelling Hospital. One of them may need surgery and one of them may need domiciliary care or at least he has to go under observation and he may need care much more than the surgery case and perhaps may be entitled to it. But the surgery case enters the hospital immediately, let us say within 24 hours, but the other man will have to wait for a long period of time, maybe forever. That man will go at the end of a long waiting list. They have never caught up with the end of that waiting list yet. So the man is sent back to his domicile. That domicile may be a bach-

elors' quarters where he cannot get any care. He will begin to deteriorate and perhaps become an object of public charity. It has amazed me the number of veterans who have reached that point where they must have physical and medical care. Unless it is a surgery case the man goes at the end of a long waiting list but the man who is the surgery case will go into the hospital immediately regardless of whether or not his financial condition is such as to allow him to go to a private hospital. He is given immediate service. Therefore Minnesota is sadly in need of additional beds and services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite understand the discrepancy between the recommendations of the Veterans' Administration and the temper of the House of Representatives. I realize that all veterans with service-connected disabilities should be given hospitalization. I do not think there is anyone who would not want to see that happen to the fullest, but what puzzles me is the language of this report. Read the report by Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator, to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Rankin]. He makes this statement:

I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program, and find that to continue construction of the full 90 authorized hospitals would result in a serious overbuilding in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements.

I insert his letter in full at this point:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1949.
Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: This is in response to your oral request of August 12, 1949, for a report on H. R. 5965, Eighty-first Congress, a bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the construction of approximately 16,000 additional hospital beds which were originally approved by the President but authorization for which was dropped in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1950 as presented to the Congress by the President pursuant to his determination to cancel or reduce the size of certain hospital projects. The facilities directed to be constructed by the terms of the bill are specifically enumerated, and the size as well as the location of such projects are stated. The enumerations are identical with the eliminations involved in the cancellation of 24 hospital projects and the reduction in size of 14 other hospital projects as directed by the President.

The action taken by the President is explained by the following excerpt from his message to the Congress transmitting his recommendations for the 1950 fiscal year budget.

"Hospital and domiciliary construction: The construction program under which the Veterans' Administration has been proceeding was planned and authorized during and immediately after the war. Now that we have the benefit of a period of postwar experience, I have reviewed the veterans' hos-

pital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients than at present.

"I have therefore directed that the program which I have previously authorized be curtailed by approximately 16,000 beds and asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. I have approved his recommendations for the cancellation of 24 hospital projects, and the reduction in planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals. This will result in a reduction of \$279,000,000 in the total of \$1,200,000,000 of construction previously authorized, and will reduce expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 by \$115,000,000. However, hospitals scheduled for completion will cost \$42,000,000 more than originally estimated. Therefore, a net rescission of \$237,000,000 in contract authorizations is recommended. Under this revised program, expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities are estimated at \$260,000,000, an increase of \$77,000,000 over the fiscal year 1949, due to the progress of construction already under way."

In addition to the considerations discussed in the President's message, there are for further consideration actions which have been taken since the mentioned curtailment of the hospital construction program.

In directing the construction of the 1,000-bed hospital at Houston, Tex., the bill fails to take into consideration that since the cancellation of this project the Veterans' Administration has acquired a naval hospital at Houston, Tex., having a constructed capacity of 1,000 beds, which was activated by the Veterans' Administration on April 15, 1949, as a 500-bed hospital.

The bill also provides for the construction of a 921-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Salisbury, N. C. This fails to take into account the fact that on July 19, 1949, the Administrator determined that a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital which had been approved for North Carolina and which was not involved in the cancellation ordered by the President should be located at Salisbury on the same site.

The bill also calls for the construction of the 1,000-bed hospital in New York, N. Y., which was eliminated by direction of the President but does not make allowance for the fact that at the same time the President approved an increase in the size of another hospital planned for that area from 1,000 to 1,250 beds.

Also, bids have been received and are now being analyzed, preliminary to an early award of the contract for a general medical hospital of 500-bed capacity, in lieu of the 750-bed hospital at Louisville, Ky. Plans and specifications for the Chicago general medical and surgical hospital based upon the revised bed capacity of 500 beds in lieu of 1,000 beds have been completed and placed on the market for bids. These bids will be opened September 6, 1949. Plans and specifications based upon the reduced bed capacity of 500 beds for Syracuse, N. Y., are now being completed and will be placed on the market for bids September 15, 1949. The plans and specifications for the projects at Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland general medical and surgical, Atlanta, Oklahoma City, St. Louis, are from 40 percent to 50 percent complete on the basis of the revised bed capacity.

In the event your committee sees fit to recommend that the 16,000 hospital beds eliminated by Presidential action should be restored to the Veterans' Administration

hospital program, it is strongly urged that no action be taken to direct particular locations, types, or numbers of hospital beds as is proposed by H. R. 5965. In locating hospital beds consideration should be given to problems of staffing beds in particular areas, the need for particular types of beds in certain localities, and the desirability of affording equal opportunities for hospital care in reasonable proximity to their homes to all veterans in the United States. It is my belief that insofar as is possible the ratio of beds to veterans in individual States should parallel the ratio authorized on a national scale.

Our studies do not demonstrate that the Veterans' Administration hospital program as it was planned prior to the Presidential cut-back, would in the light of later events have been the most desirable distribution of the beds then authorized for construction. Your committee will be interested in the attached chart which indicates the distribution of the hospital beds by States together with the estimated number of veterans per hospital bed.

The Veterans' Administration has considerable concern whether any increased number of beds over 120,000 can be staffed in accordance with satisfactory medical standards in the foreseeable future. Currently there are approximately 4,000 beds unavailable due to inability to recruit personnel. There will be approximately 131,000 beds when the present construction program is completed, composed of 104,000 existing beds, plus 40,000 authorized, less 13,000 to be closed. The proposed restoration of the cut-back of 16,000 beds could not but aggravate the staffing problem.

It is clear from the above-quoted excerpt from the President's budget message that the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

If the Veterans' Administration claims that they have enough beds to take care of the veterans, and if Mr. Johnson, who has charge of the armed-services forces, who have a lot of hospitals in this country which they are closing down—for instance, take the hospital in Valley Forge, Pa., where they are closing down 1,650 beds; it certainly seems as if the Members of Congress and the Veterans' Administration and the Armed Services Committee and those who have charge of it are not getting together in the right way. They show no business ability in this Administration. Oh, what a shame, how inefficient, how uncalled for.

Now, you have \$279,000,000 in this bill. It seems to me that the Members of Congress have no right to waste \$279,000,000. If you can get those organizations together and save that money, that is your duty. That is my duty. We want efficiency in government; this we do not have.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. If they would take over the hospitals which they own, lock, stock, and barrel, they are assessed at \$80,000,000; if they would take those, there is \$80,000,000 that we would save at one clip; and they are not firetraps either.

Mr. RICH. That is the point I am trying to make. They are closing down these hospitals. It seems to me that the

Members of Congress are not doing a good job unless they coordinate these facilities. Give the veterans all the medical care they need, and give them the hospitals that you and I would desire them to have. But keep open those in armed forces and save \$80,000,000. Eighty million dollars is a whale of a lot of money to me.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the most distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MASON. The Members of Congress cannot coordinate the hospital facilities. That is up to the executive department, and they refuse to do it.

Mr. RICH. Why do they not do it? Then let the executive department of the Government keep open hospitals we have, and save millions of dollars, and yet give veterans the hospital facilities that are necessary. It is high time that we saw that they do it, or the people of this country ought to turn them out, lock, stock, and barrel. It is a shame we have not more sound business methods in this Congress. I want efficiency as well as economy. It could be had. Why not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to give this Congress a bird's-eye view of the problem that is now before the committee. This Congress, in its wisdom, after due consideration by the Veterans' Committee and the Appropriations Committee, made an appropriation for these hospital beds. The President in his Executive order said to this Congress, in substance, "You do not know what you did at that time. You did not have the information that I have. Therefore, in my Executive order I veto what the Congress in its judgment has done."

This bill is an assertion by the Congress that it knew what it was doing and that the President's order is going to be vetoed by this bill. Now, that is all there is to it. The question is, Is the President right in saying to us that we did not know what we were doing, or are we right in saying to him that he, in his Executive order, did not know what he was doing?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The President was getting his information from the Bureau of the Budget that did not even consult the Congress or the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MASON. In substance, the President is trying to say, "You fellows are asking for economy. Here it is. How do you like it?" By doing so, he is putting us in a bad light with the people of this Nation. That is exactly the situation that is before us.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The five hospitals that they are closing down, plus the six that they are cutting back, are 11 hospitals, with 8,000 beds available, which the taxpayers of this country own and operate. If they would make the Veterans' Administration use those hospitals, the veterans would get 8,000 beds immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to answer the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

I call attention to the fact that the head of the Veterans' Administration has said that many of those hospitals the gentleman is talking about are so badly scattered that they could not be operated economically, and that some of them are built out of materials that would make them regular firetraps.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not care what they said. That is not true.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I value the gentleman's opinion, but that is what the Veterans' Administration said.

Mr. RIVERS. I have traveled 8,000 miles, and I have seen a lot of them that you have not seen.

Mr. RANKIN. But you have not seen them all.

Mr. RIVERS. I have seen more than you have.

Mr. RANKIN. Maybe so.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What is this statement going around that many of the veterans are in jails because you do not have hospital facilities? There is no truth in that statement either.

Mr. RANKIN. I know of one veteran in a Northern State who was sent to a hospital and he could not get a bed. He went back home to enter a private hospital and he died on the way. We are trying to take care of these veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute for the purpose of saying that to my mind it is extremely foolish to close the service hospitals at the present time, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps hospitals. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], made a very serious speech regarding possible war in the immediate future. If you close your hospitals, you have no equipment to take care of the men who may be killed or wounded in war. It is folly to close your hospitals. I speak with knowledge, because I saw what was done in the last two wars.

Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Can the gentleman from Mississippi tell us where Members of Congress may get copies of hearings on this bill? I have looked, but I can find none.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is supposed to have them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman from Mississippi inform the Members of the House where we can find copies of the hearings that were held on this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. On this bill? This bill was introduced after these beds were wiped out by the dictation of the Bureau of the Budget. You can get the hearings from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, this committee did not hold hearings on this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Hearings were held on several phases of the hospital program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, before we rush headlong into the adoption of this bill, which seems to be what is about to happen, I think we ought to have some questions asked and answered. The first question is: Is there a lack at this time of Government hospital facilities? The answer to that obviously is no, because the Defense Department is closing down existing hospitals.

The second question is: Why cannot the President turn some of those hospitals over to the Veterans' Administration? The answer to that is: There is no reason why he cannot do it; he ought to do it, and this House ought to insist that he do it before we embark upon another huge new building program for the Veterans' Administration.

The third question is: What is our policy in regard to the entrance of veterans into these hospitals? The answer is that we have none. By this measure here today we are going into the back door and giving credence to the policy that the United States Government is to furnish veterans' hospitals for all veterans regardless of the nature and origin of their disability. The report of the Veterans' Administration shows that every service-connected disabled veteran is being cared for. Under the existing building program the provisions for non-service-connected cases would be greatly liberalized.

The fourth question is: Are we going to get the people to staff the new hospitals that we are going to build when we do not have enough people to staff the hospitals that are already in operation and would be built without this law?

And then one final question, if I have time: How are you going to get the President to put this law into effect when you could not get him to put into effect the appropriations that we have already made for the very things authorized by this bill? Anybody sitting in this Chamber knows that the President will veto this bill, because it is contrary to his program. The veto will not be overridden in this House.

The situation, then, boils itself down to this being a political gesture on the part of this body. It is no more than that. It smacks too much of attempting to show up the President of the United

States. I do not believe in a policy of that kind when the President's policy, according to the VA report, is justified the way it stands. It will not be good politics to vote against this bill, but those of you who have been talking about economy where economy can be practiced should vote against this bill. Failure to pass this bill will not deprive a single service-connected disabled veteran of his hospitalization.

Mr. Chairman, it is pertinent here to quote from a letter written by the Veterans' Administrator to the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, which is quoted in the committee report:

To continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients than at present—

And on the following page—

Currently there are approximately 4,000 beds unavailable due to inability to recruit personnel. There will be approximately 131,000 beds when the present construction program is completed, composed of 104,000 existing beds, plus 40,000 authorized, less 13,000 to be closed. The proposed restoration of the cut-back of 16,000 beds could but aggravate the staffing problem.

If you are for economy and if you want to avoid the position of just showing up the President when you have a chance to do so, I think in good conscience that the Members of this House ought to vote for the motion to recommit that will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY]. This bill cannot be justified on the basis of a real service to the veterans of America.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. There is no question but that new hospitals are greatly needed for our veterans. There are long waiting lists in every State of veterans needing hospitalization. Since the orders were issued by the Department of Defense to close several of our Army and Navy general hospitals, where veteran patients have been cared for, numerous fatalities have occurred because of lack of hospital beds in VA hospitals.

I could go into this question in detail, but time will not permit. I do believe, however, that this legislation should be amended to compel the VA to take over modern, equipped hospitals now being closed by the Department of Defense. Such action would not only save millions of dollars but would provide immediate hospital facilities for thousands of veterans who are now on the VA waiting lists.

There is no question but that this Congress will appear ridiculous to economy-minded taxpayers if we authorize the construction of new hospitals at this time within short distances of modern, fireproof, existing facilities that are being abandoned by the Department of Defense.

Here is what will happen in the State of Michigan if this bill is passed. Two new hospitals, costing millions of dollars, will be constructed within 80 miles of an existing facility, namely, Percy Jones General Hospital at Battle Creek. This bill provides for a VA surgical hospital at Grand Rapids, a distance of 63 miles, and a VA tubercular hospital at a distance of about 80 miles. These two hospitals will provide a total of 950 new beds, while a 1,200-bed institution that would cost \$30,000,000 to replace would stand vacant or be given away.

I reiterate that I believe this legislation should carry a provision to compel the VA to take over the Percy Jones General Hospital instead of building new hospitals at Grand Rapids and near Detroit. I believe that a motion to recommit with instructions to report this bill forthwith with such provisions is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate my support for the motion to recommit which I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] intends to offer. This motion to recommit would direct the Veterans' Administration to investigate the possibility of using as VA hospitals some of the Army hospitals which may be closed in the near future. This means that the 200-bed general medical hospital proposed for Grand Rapids under H. R. 5965 would be canceled in favor of a VA hospital in Battle Creek, Mich. If the Secretary of Defense does close the Percy Jones Hospital it would be wise for the VA to take over jurisdiction. Such a transfer would provide immediate veteran hospital facilities not now available and would save the cost of constructing a new hospital to meet the needs of veterans in Michigan.

If anyone has any doubts as to the need for additional VA beds in Michigan they should take a look at the chart on pages 5 and 6 of the committee report on H. R. 5965. Michigan and particularly western Michigan has been unfairly and inequitably treated in the past. Our veterans deserve far better treatment in the future.

Although I favor the Kearney motion to recommit, I wholeheartedly endorse H. R. 5965. It should be approved despite the cutback order of President Truman. Mr. Truman acted unwisely in removing from the VA hospital program those facilities badly needed in the State of Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has implied that every person who votes for this bill is voting for it for political reasons. I intend to vote for the bill and it is not for political reasons.

Since World War I, the broad national policy as far as hospitalization of veterans is concerned, has been to provide hospitalization for all service-connected cases and for all non-service-connected cases who attest that they cannot afford

to pay for hospitalization. The question before the Congress today is not necessarily 16,000 additional hospital beds, it is a question of whether or not we are to change the national policy as far as veterans hospitalization is concerned. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, that if this policy is to continue, that additional hospital facilities will be required to meet the need.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has testified a number of times that it was the responsibility of Congress to determine the number of hospital beds. On July 31, 1945, the Veterans' Administration had 71,210 beds for 6,639,090 veterans, or 1 bed for every 93 veterans. As of January 5, 1949, the Veterans' Administration had 104,591 beds for 18,663,000 veterans, or 1 to each 178 veterans. The original hospital construction program authorized by Congress would, when completed, add another 55,106 authorized beds to the total of January 5, 1949, and bring the available number to 159,697. This would provide a ratio of 1 bed to every 117 veterans. Application of the curtailment order by the President would result in a revised total of 144,576 authorized beds, giving a ratio of 1 bed for every 129 veterans. Of this revised number of 144,576 beds, however, a total of 13,405 are in temporary facilities taken over from the armed forces which were to be abandoned upon completion of new hospitals. Elimination of these temporary facilities, some of which would be discontinued immediately, would reduce the available beds to 131,171, or a ratio of 1 bed to every 142 veterans.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has testified that on the basis of present policy of hospitalization for veterans approximately 160,000 beds are estimated as the requirement to meet the present needs. Mr. Chairman, when this curtailment order was issued, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was on an inspection trip of the hospitals and knew nothing about it until he received a call. This curtailment order originated with the Bureau of the Budget, and although they had testified that it is not their intention to change the national policy, they are actually changing the national policy. The Congress of the United States should either reaffirm or clarify the policy of hospitalization for veterans, and, of course, this bill will be a step toward that end. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say very much in a minute. I did want to throw some light on this subject from an appropriations point of view but cannot in this limited time. I thank the gentleman. I realize he has had a lot of requests for time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to describe the situation in other

parts of the country. I do want to testify to the fact that there is an immediate and a critical need for a tuberculosis hospital in our section of the country. There was a day when they sent tubercular cases to distant places in the West and up in North Carolina to be cured. These patients would come back and break down again. Today the medical profession advises that a tubercular patient be cured in the area of the country where he expects to live.

There are no adequate facilities down there today although there are many veterans afflicted with tuberculosis who are unable to get into a veterans' hospital. In my place as a Member of Congress I state to you that the veterans in my part of the country who are afflicted with tuberculosis are not able to get the hospitalization they need at the hands of the Veterans' Administration. The regional office in Atlanta, Ga., will tell you frankly that they cannot hospitalize these patients because they do not have the hospital facilities to take care of them; at least that is what they tell me.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, there is an emergency, there is a critical need for tuberculosis hospitals as authorized in this bill. The land has been acquired, the plans have been drawn, funds have been appropriated and the veterans are asking the Congress of the United States to make the facilities available. I join in their request and urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill, H. R. 5965, because I believe that it is an obligation and responsibility of this Government to provide adequate hospital facilities and accommodations for our sick and disabled veterans. During war and while in good health they fought for us—now in time of peace it is no more than right and proper that in sickness we should provide and take care of them. I repeat here as I have said before on the floor of this House that "There is nothing too good for our veterans," and that is particularly true with reference to the sick and disabled veterans. Let's provide for them ample hospital facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], I am standing in the well of this House, today, not for political reasons, but for the purpose of supporting the veterans of this country who carried the Stars and Stripes on the many frontiers of battle not only in the Spanish-American War, but in World War I and World War II. I challenge the statement that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, or the Members of this House are playing politics when they ask the Congress of the United States to restore the 16,000 hospital beds that the President of the United States arbitrarily cut from the Veterans' Administration Hospital program.

This subject is not a new one. It was discussed before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; it was discussed on the floor of this House, and if you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the first session of this Congress you will find that we spent some time in discussing the item of \$237,000,000 which represented the cost of these 16,000 beds and which was part of the deficiency appropriation before the House at that time. Furthermore, if you read the hearings before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs when the over-all Veterans' Administration Hospital program was discussed you will find that the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved these 16,000 beds, and that the Bureau of the Budget took similar action. At a later date, and after Congress had approved the 16,000 beds as part of the Veterans' Administration Hospital program President Truman arbitrarily and by Executive order, cancelled these 16,000 beds.

I want to say to the membership of this committee that I have known of mentally ill veterans of World War II being confined to jails because there were no Veterans' Administration hospital facilities available for them. I disagree with the statement of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], when he says there are no long lists of veterans in Pennsylvania awaiting hospitalization. I want to emphasize that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Coatesville, Pa., today has 1,500 veterans on its waiting list; Canandaigua, N. Y., Perry Point, Md., and Chillicothe, Ohio, also have long waiting lists. Then we cannot forget the TB hospitals, for they too have long waiting lists.

Hearings were held in the Senate on this specific subject after the President had canceled these 16,000 beds. Upon reading those hearings you will find that there appeared before the Senate committee the representatives of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Speaking for these great veterans' organizations were the department of adjutants of every single State in the United States, and they furnished the committee first-hand information. Yes, the committee was told just how many veterans had applied for hospitalization and how many veterans had been told that there were no facilities available. I say to you in all sincerity that the hospital problem of our veteran population is just beginning. The average age of the Spanish-American War veteran today is 78, the average of the World War I veteran is 58, and the average age of the World War II veteran is 32. As these veterans become older their need for hospitalization becomes greater.

Therefore, in addition to restoring these 16,000 beds I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that Congress should direct the President of the United States to transfer to the Veterans' Administration the military hospitals that the Department of National Defense have ordered to be closed on June 30, 1950. The 8,000 beds that would be made available from the military hospitals added to the 16,000 beds provided by this bill will go a long way in

taking care of the long waiting lists of veterans who are in need of immediate hospitalization.

In conclusion, I hope that this House will approve this bill because it is needed legislation in view of the pressing problem in providing our veteran population with adequate hospital facilities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that today is the first time I ever heard politics mentioned with reference to this subject matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I fervently hope that the individual who made the statement that providing 16,000 beds in veterans' hospitals is playing politics will have an opportunity to give further study to the hospital situation as it affects our veteran population.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this legislation, H. R. 5965.

This bill (H. R. 5965) provides for the construction of 16,000 additional beds at Veterans' Administration hospitals and all information available indicates the need for this increased hospital bed capacity.

The bill provides for a 500-bed general medical hospital at Chattanooga, in my State, and a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Memphis, Tenn. These proposed facilities have heretofore been authorized and plans have been made for their construction. To abandon this program now would mean a false economy. And in addition, Mr. Chairman, on most all occasions when an effort has been made to assist veterans in gaining admittance to a hospital for needed care and treatment, the reports generally are that there are no beds available and the veteran is forced to take his place on the waiting list. Some exceptions, of course, have appeared in cases of extreme emergency.

The President and the Veterans' Administrator have indicated that these additional beds are not needed at this time. However, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House unanimously reported this bill, recognizing the need for increased hospital bed capacity.

Although extensive hearings have not been held before the House committee on this subject, the members of the committee know from their own personal experiences in dealing with the veterans themselves and veterans' hospitals of the need in this instance. Hearings were held in this connection in the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Welfare where it was demonstrated that there was need and necessity for additional hospital bed capacity.

While it is true that the so-called Hoover Commission report has also indicated the opinion that there is a lack of need for more hospitals, various veterans' organizations have heretofore exploded the fallacy of the Hoover Commission recommendations as they apply

to the Veterans' Administration, particularly the VA hospital program. Veterans' organizations and veterans themselves know the situation to be other than has been reported by the Hoover Commission.

The passage of this bill is urged. It will, in addition, focus the attention of the Veterans' Administrator on the need for a thorough study of hospital bed requirements. We know that the peak load and demand has not as yet been reached and we should plan now for the requirements which will come in the future.

In this connection, the proposition that has been advanced that the Army and Navy have certain hospitals that are not being used and that such hospitals could be transferred to the Veterans' Administrator should certainly be considered and investigated, looking toward the providing of adequate hospital facilities for the veterans of our Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this legislation because I cannot subscribe to the arguments made here that there is no shortage of hospitals. In the area in which I live there is a great shortage of hospitals. The hospitals in the city of Chicago are so crowded that we cannot take care of our patients. That applies to the county, the Vaughan and the Hines Hospitals.

In answer to the arguments in opposition to this legislation on economic grounds I say that argument does not appeal to me when \$3,000,000,000 was voted to sustain economic conditions abroad, and where a substantial amount of that money is being spent on the health of people who brought about some of the wounds that our soldiers are suffering from and contributed to some of the diseases they are suffering from at the present time. This bill ought to be passed. It is good legislation. We need these hospitals and I am going to support the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is much more that can be said on this bill which has not been said. Most of the Members undoubtedly have their minds made up. One thing is certain in my opinion—something is rotten in Denmark so far as the Administration's policy for hospital beds for veterans is concerned. There seems to be a complete misunderstanding with reference to the number of beds for regular veterans of the Army and the Navy and the number of beds needed by the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities. If this bill will do no more than to bring forcibly to the attention of the Administration the fact that the Congress has said that there should be more beds for veterans with service-connected disabilities it will have achieved its purpose. If a survey discloses that we do not need 16,000 additional beds the fact that we have passed this bill will not mean that those hospitals are going to be built, but we will be providing a means for building enough

hospitals to meet the needs of veterans with service-connected disabilities. For that reason I think this bill ought to be passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record in favor of H. R. 5965. This bill provides for an additional 16,000 hospital beds which were canceled in December 1948, at the direction of the President, pursuant to recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

The report which accompanies this bill states:

All of the projects specified in this bill have previously been approved and a need has been demonstrated for the construction of these hospitals at the places indicated and for restoration of beds in the hospitals sought to be reduced in size.

This statement in the report is sufficient evidence for me to support this legislation; however, we find all of the veterans' organizations—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS of World War II—heartily in favor of this bill.

I am supporting this bill in order that we may have available ample space for our disabled veterans without requiring them to take their turn on a waiting list, in many instances aggravating their condition while waiting, on account of the lack of beds in a veterans' hospital. There is nothing more disheartening than for a veteran in immediate need of hospitalization to be advised that he must wait his turn in order that a bed may be furnished him in some veterans' hospital. This condition has existed in my own State of Kentucky, and now exists.

Today the average age of Spanish-American War veterans is 78; veterans of World War I, 58; and veterans of World War II, 32 years of age. There is no good reason why these veterans should not be entitled to immediate hospitalization. The hospitals to be constructed are general medical, tuberculosis, rehabilitation, and neuropsychiatric.

The bill provides for altering the present general medical hospital now being constructed by the Veterans' Administration at Louisville, Ky., from 500 to 750 beds. There cannot be any sound argument advanced against the great need for the 250 extra beds in Louisville, Ky. It seems that all these hospitals to be constructed, as well as the buildings to be altered, under this legislation, are located in cities where adequate and suitable personnel can be obtained for staffing purposes.

If we fail to pass this legislation, Mr. Chairman, we will fail to recognize a legal duty that we owe to our disabled veterans.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the issue or question before us today, as we consider this bill, which would provide and make available 16,000 more beds in hospitals for our veterans of the Spanish-

American War, World War I, and World War II, is whether there is need for them. In other words, are those veterans with service-connected disabilities being provided with adequate care and hospitalization that their conditions require and demand? And, are those veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, who are without means, being extended the treatment in hospitals, as provided by law?

We as Members of Congress know from actual experience in our respective districts with veterans that they are not being extended or are they receiving hospital care for the very reasons that the Veterans' Administration does not have enough hospitals to meet the great demand from those young men and women still suffering from wounds, injuries, and sickness directly attributable to their service for their country in time of war. The war for them is not yet over.

In my own district I have found that in many cases in each of the veterans' hospitals there is a waiting list particularly in neuropsychiatric cases, and in most instances the veteran has to wait months before he is admitted, during which time he is a burden to himself and his family.

Is this treating them fairly? Are we fulfilling the least of our obligations to him when we fail to provide the means to alleviate his pains and suffering? I say we are not.

The question has arisen that the Department of Defense is closing hospitals throughout the country which could be used by the Veterans' Administration. If that is so, I believe that it is our duty to see that our Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration get together in view of the seriousness of this problem. Let them brush aside petty differences and unimportant technicalities and do something to relieve this situation. If the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Veterans will coordinate their forces I am sure a solution will evolve which will permit the job to be done with efficiency and with great savings to our taxpayers.

Mr. PETELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is of the utmost importance that this bill be passed. In Florida veterans come from every State in the Union. Long waiting lists exist while veterans die or languish in jail. Many of the sick veterans come from your State. Mental ills are aggravated by long delays in treatment. This hospitalization can prevent added expense for hospitalization later.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, for some unknown reason ever since the creation of the Veterans' Bureau in 1920 Pennsylvania has been treated like an unwanted stepchild. In the 12 years following World War I, with a veteran population of over 375,000, Pennsylvania was awarded only two hospitals. One was constructed at Aspinwall, Pa., in 1925 and the other at Coatesville, Pa., in 1930. The total bed capacity of both of these hospitals was under 800 beds. This was but a small portion of the bed space provided for other States with a similar or smaller number of veterans.

Later, another hospital was constructed at Lebanon, Pa.

Then came World War II and Pennsylvania contributed over 1,200,000 men and women to the armed services, making a grand total of over 1,424,000 veterans for both wars. The only other State that has a larger veteran population is New York which has over 2,000,000 veterans.

The veterans' situation in Pennsylvania in 1945 was in a desperate condition with only four hospitals in operation. Then in that same year the veterans' hospital-construction program was passed and the Veterans' Administration began a study of the hospital situation in Pennsylvania. The critical situation and the lack of bed space was quickly recognized and the location of seven new hospitals was recommended. The sites of these hospitals were chosen according to the areas with large veteran population and the ability to staff the hospitals with competent and qualified physicians, technicians, and nurses. All seven of the locations chosen by the Veterans' Administration met these requirements. This program would have provided over 4,400 new beds for veterans and although this was a smaller number than the veterans' organization expected, it was felt that it would help to alleviate the acute situation in Pennsylvania.

In view of the careful and prolonged consideration which has been given to the actual needs of our veterans, we were astonished when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced in January of this year that our State was to lose 1,400 beds of those already allocated. This was approximately 10 percent of the curtailment in the entire country.

For some reason or other there has been a delay in the construction program in Pennsylvania. Construction has not yet begun on four out of the seven hospitals allocated and all four were involved in the curtailment order. The veterans of Pennsylvania are not to blame for the lack of progress in the hospital-construction program in our State and they should certainly not be the victims of this dilatory action.

The additional hospital beds provided for in this measure will help us meet the hospital needs of our ailing and disabled veterans in Pennsylvania. I hope that H. R. 5965 will pass without opposition.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the proposed motion to recommit which would call for an immediate report from the Committee on Veterans Affairs with an amendment which requires the Veterans' Administration to take into consideration all armed services and other present hospital facilities available before embarking upon a new building program, I shall vote for the motion to recommit and then shall vote for the bill.

I am strongly in favor of providing complete and adequate hospital facilities for all veterans but I do know that in Georgia, as elsewhere, there are armed services' facilities available which the Veterans' Administration to date has refused to utilize.

While I am voting for H. R. 5965, nevertheless, I realize that the construction of new hospitals will not alone solve

the problem of hospitalization for veterans. We must make possible by adequate appropriations and by encouragement to young men to enter into the medical profession, adequate staffs for the hospitals we now have and for the proposed new construction.

I am, therefore, voting for H. R. 5965 in the hope that all available hospital facilities in America will be consolidated into an over-all program of hospitalization. I do not mean by this that I favor the Hoover Commission Report which would set up a new medical service to take over the hospitals now conducted by the armed services, the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration. After careful hearings, a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member, has come to the definite conclusion that the operation of the three hospital programs should not be placed under one medical administration. However, it was the consensus of opinion that there should be consolidation of the three services which now build hospitals and all available facilities used to the best advantage. This will mean better service for veterans at a lower cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this bill, H. R. 5965, and urge its passage.

Both Houses of Congress have heretofore acted favorably on this legislation, and the funds were appropriated for the construction of these hospitals. In fact, many of the hospitals included in the former legislation have been completed.

In the case of the hospital at Chattanooga, Tenn., the land has been acquired, plans drawn, and actual construction was about to commence when the order to discontinue was received.

The Veterans' Administration has already expended \$441,000 on the proposed hospital at Chattanooga. The land was purchased for \$27,000, plans were completed at the cost of \$282,000, and \$132,000 spent for other services. In view of this large expenditure already made on the hospital at Chattanooga, it seems very wasteful on the part of the Government to abandon its construction.

I do not profess to know the existing conditions throughout the United States, but I do know a 500-bed medical and surgical hospital at Chattanooga is badly needed for the veterans of this and adjoining territory. The proposed hospital at Chattanooga is centrally located and would serve Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama, as the city of Chattanooga is located almost at the point of these three States.

There are in Tennessee 400,000 veterans, 320,000 in Georgia, and almost as many in Alabama. When the construction of this hospital was ordered discontinued, there were 1,008 veterans awaiting admission to a hospital in the Atlanta area, which included Tennessee. Seven hundred and fourteen of these veterans were required to wait from 1 to 60 days for admission. One hundred and sixty-eight were required to wait from 61 to 128 days for admission, and 65 waited over 180 days. Since that time conditions have not improved, but are rapidly becoming worse in our section.

Under the original hospital program, the State of Tennessee was allocated 2 hospitals—a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Memphis and a 500-bed general medical hospital at Chattanooga. When the cut-back came, Tennessee lost both of these proposed hospitals, with no additional beds provided in our State to relieve the present need.

In view of the proposed location of the Chattanooga hospital and the great need for its construction to serve the veterans of Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia, I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied it is the sense and purpose of this House to provide necessary hospital facilities for the honorable discharged veterans of our several wars. There is only one change in the hospital situation since we last considered this subject and that is, the need is even greater now than heretofore. As veterans grow older it is natural that more of them will need hospitalization. I am satisfied that the vast majority will vote favorably on this measure which carries mandatory powers.

The statement which was made this morning that veterans who honorably served our country in time of war are incarcerated in the common jails of the country is no exaggeration. It was never the intention of Congress to leave these gallant sons to whom we are so greatly indebted in neglect and misery.

The finest and most logical way to encourage young men to serve their country in its several branches of defense is to treat their fathers, who have served before them, like human beings.

There is a crying need to proceed with the erection of the hospitals as heretofore authorized. I cannot urge upon the Congress too strongly that we should go forward with this program; and I hope to see the enactment of H. R. 5965 without further delay.

Following is a previous statement which I have made:

The proposed hospital beds for South Carolina are greatly needed. Even with the additional beds, we will be far below the national average. Under present conditions, we have scarcely half the required beds. Hundreds of veterans have filed requests for hospitalization and have been approved, but many of them have to wait as long as 40 to 60 days before gaining admission. The large number of veterans who have been processed for hospitalization does not reflect the need for additional beds. Many veterans in need of hospitalization refrain from asking for the service because they know how difficult it is to get favorable action. There can be no question but that the need is great.

Since the contemplated additional beds for South Carolina are to be for general medical treatment, I should like to point out there appears to be no acute shortage of general medical doctors and nurses. Proof is evident that we can staff the hospitals.

I speak with special reference to the authorized veterans' general medical hospital for Greenville, S. C. This project was approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the director of the Bureau of the Budget, the director of the Veterans' Administration, and the President of the United States.

As we seek to economize let it not be said that the ax of economy struck first at the disabled veterans. I sincerely hope that the veterans' hospitals heretofore provided for may be constructed without further delay.

As a part of my remarks, I herewith attach a statement I made before the special Senate committee:

"STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON VETERANS' HOSPITAL CUT-BACK, MARCH 24, 1949

"Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a statement concerning the cut-back in the veterans' hospital-construction program which was announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs some time ago and which is currently under investigation by this committee. This program involves the complete elimination of 24 projects and an alteration downward of 14 others. The facilities for a total of approximately 16,000 hospital beds will thus be eliminated, including 11,000 in the projects completely abandoned and 5,000 in the projects which are scheduled for reduction.

"After a study of the available facts and data I am opposed to this cut-back. Neither the interests of the veterans nor the country as a whole will be served if this cancellation of the construction program is allowed to stand. In my own State of South Carolina there is at present only one veterans' hospital in operation. This hospital is located at Columbia and has a standard bed capacity of 606 beds. According to available figures there are 167,000 World War II veterans in the State and an additional 34,000 veterans from other wars, making a total of 201,000 veterans. With the standard bed capacity of this hospital being 606, that makes an average of 332 veterans for each bed. However, the hospital has made use of 94 emergency beds to expand the facilities to a total of 700 beds, 670 of which are currently in use, and the remaining 30 are being held in reserve for emergencies. Even with this use of emergency beds, there is still available an average of only 1 bed per 290 veterans. This figure shows that available facilities are only one-third those of 1945 and the ratio is even lower if the standard figure of 606 beds, which is the maximum available over a long period of time, is used. This situation was to be remedied considerably by the expansion of the hospital at Columbia to a standard operating capacity of 800 beds, an increase of 194 over the present facilities. There was also to be constructed at Greenville a new 200-bed hospital. Both of these projects are among those to be eliminated. Even with the addition of these 394 beds the ratio of veterans to beds in South Carolina would remain at 200 to 1. The national figures, which are considered far too high for the safety of our veterans' health, are in the vicinity of 178 veterans for each bed. It is obvious from these figures that the average in South Carolina would still be above the present national average even with the addition of the 394 beds. That these beds are sorely needed is evidenced by the waiting lists. As of January 21, 1949, there was a total of 964 veterans who had been cleared for admission through the former branch office at Atlanta, Ga. This office was headquarters for South Carolina and for other Southern States, so the figures as to how many were waiting for admission to the hospital at Columbia are not available. Nevertheless, the number was substantial, probably running into the hundreds. Of these 964 veterans awaiting admission to hospitals, 370 were forced to wait up to 20 days, 191 waited from 21 to 40 days, and 403 were waiting over 40 days. These are appalling figures. Almost two-thirds of these veterans had to wait over 20 days, and almost one-half had to wait over 40 days. As alarming as these figures are, they still do not tell the whole story. Often only veterans with emergency non-service-connected afflictions are being admitted because of the bed shortage, and when the veterans or their representatives learn this fact, they do not even apply for admission. These facts are incon-

trovertible evidence that more veterans' hospitals are urgently needed in South Carolina.

"In explaining the reduction of the hospital program the Veterans' Administration officials stated that, while more hospitals may be needed, there are not enough doctors to staff them. I am not prepared to discuss this aspect of the question as a whole for the country at large, but I am familiar with conditions in South Carolina. In Greenville the hospital under construction was to be of the general medical type. There does not appear to be a great shortage of general medical doctors in this area, at least not a sufficiently great shortage to warrant the cancellation of the project.

"An additional reason to continue building the hospital at Greenville is to prevent a large sum of money from being wasted with no benefits accruing to anyone. A total of \$303,000 has been spent on the project so far. All of this money will be lost if the project is not finished. I am not one who believes in throwing good money after bad, but that analogy will not hold in this instance. This hospital is badly needed, and it is needed now. We owe it to the veterans on the waiting lists to see that it is completed. Nothing that Veterans' Administration officials say can change the following facts: First, that although the number of veterans has jumped from 66,000 to 201,000, the number of authorized hospital beds is being maintained at 606; the fact that 94 more beds have been temporarily made available by the use of porches and corridors is no argument at all, since the standard figure is still 606. Second, that hundreds of veterans are awaiting admission and the average number of beds available in this area is far below the national average, which is itself too low. Third, that plans have been laid, hundreds of thousands of dollars spent, and that facilities and personnel are available to run this hospital upon its completion. Any arguments against the completion of this hospital seem spurious if we are sincere in the belief that our veterans must be protected.

"Now let us examine the national picture concerning this cut-back. I do not pretend to have as much knowledge about the national situation as about my home State. However, many of the general facts have been made available to me, and it is not difficult to draw conclusions.

"It was the Veterans' Administration which originally recommended the construction of the hospital facilities which have now been ordered canceled. Before the cancellation, this recommendation had been approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States. The cancellation order affects construction in 18 States and the District of Columbia. While it is evident that certain sections of the country need additional hospitals more than others, available figures show that more hospitals are needed everywhere. On January 31 of this year there were 16,188 veterans who had had their applications approved and were awaiting hospitalization. The number who did not apply because of the long waiting lists is naturally not known, but such number is undoubtedly huge. From a moral standpoint, this is a sad state of affairs, but from the practical viewpoint, it seems even more foolish. Failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will in many cases result in aggravation of injuries, not to mention the suffering, and these injuries may some day result in added claims against the Government. If this program of reduction is being promoted in the interest of economy, its authors had better think twice. In the long run it will cost the Government far more than the cost of completing the hospitals.

"The national ratio of hospital beds per veteran is today 1 to 178. That figure is supposed to drop to 142 when the construction now under way is completed, but it

would drop to 124 if the canceled projects are restored. In 1940, less than 10 years ago, the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved, and the President approved in principle, a construction program which would have made a ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans available within 10 years. Any figure which is three times that amount seems high. Any figure more than three times as high seems entirely out of reason if the interests and the welfare of the veterans are to be protected.

"As I previously stated, I am not entirely familiar with all of the special problems concerning the veterans' hospitals in other sections of the country, but every section has a problem of some type. In certain sections of the far West hospitals are so far apart as to be almost inaccessible. In my own section of the country there is such a scarcity of available beds that veterans in direct need must often wait long periods of time before being admitted. Just when a partial solution to these problems was in sight, the solution suddenly vanished. We must not allow this to happen. In spite of the argument advanced that doctors are not available to staff these proposed hospitals, several of the cities in question have submitted evidence that the medical talent is available.

"In view of these facts and figures, I am of the firm opinion that the cancellation of the hospital program must not be allowed to stand. In the case of my own State a particular hardship will be visited upon the veterans, who have, and will continue to have, facilities so far below the national average that the situation is almost disgraceful. I sincerely believe that a restoration of the program for 16,000 additional beds is desirable and necessary for the veterans and that the whole country will be benefited by this program."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5965, a proposal that would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the construction of veterans' hospitals which will provide approximately 16,000 additional beds.

If I recall correctly, this section of the Veterans' Administration hospital construction program was canceled last December at the direction of the President pursuant to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The matter had received the approval of both Houses of the Congress, and the appropriation bill, which we have been considering, and will continue to consider immediately following the consideration of this proposal, continues the authorization for the projects enumerated in the bill. Consequently, this is the second time the Committee on Appropriations has recommended to the House that it approve the necessary funds for construction, and we would certainly be breaking faith with that committee as well as the other legislative committees and above all the veterans of this country if we do not favorably enact this legislation.

I appreciate the fact the records show that there exists several thousand surplus beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals today. This is primarily due to the fact that the Veterans' Administration is unable to obtain a sufficient number of qualified doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and other technical personnel to properly staff the hospitals and adequately care for patients who would fill the vacant beds. However, the record does not show a fact with which you and

I are extremely familiar and that is—there are veterans with service-connected and non-service-connected disabilities far in excess of the existing vacant beds available, and therefore, are unable to obtain the necessary hospitalization which our Government is legally obligated to furnish. Each of us receives a number of letters every week soliciting aid in enabling a veteran to get admitted for hospitalization.

The measure does not provide for a construction of a hospital within my district but it does provide for the construction of one at Charlotte, N. C., Greenville, S. C., and additions to the hospital at Columbia, S. C., and Atlanta, Ga. These facilities would be located in areas which would be easily available to the veterans of my district and State.

We have heard quite a great deal of argument concerning the bill to the effect that it would increase the so-called surplus of beds which now exists. The argument sounds good, but in my opinion it is merely fiction. The fact that we cannot properly staff the existing facilities does not necessarily mean that we have a surplus. Furthermore, in these times of apparent unrest and threatened change, especially in view of the atom bomb, the fact that we have vacant beds at the present does not mean that we have a surplus today. We know not what we might have need for tomorrow. It is our constitutional duty and responsibility to see that there are sufficient and ample beds to care for any emergency. It is my opinion that we shall sadly neglect our duty if we fail to pass the measure before us.

I have heard the question raised, "Why are we constructing additional hospital facilities when the Secretary of Defense has directed the closing of a number of Army and Navy hospitals?" That is a pertinent question. But, first I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration are three separate and distinct agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and each are charged with separate and distinct duties toward the defense and welfare of our Government. I question the wisdom of the order of Secretary Johnson in closing the hospitals because the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Forces, which investigated the order, has stated and recommended that the order should be rescinded because it will cost more for the transportation of patients and administrative personnel than will be saved by the closing of the hospitals, and that is to say nothing of the inconvenience that will be involved.

If the order is not to be rescinded then I think it advisable and imperative in the interest of good government that the Veterans' Administration make the necessary arrangements with Departments of the Army and Navy for the acquisition of the hospitals concerned prior to engaging in the construction of all the hospitals listed in this bill. That is a problem for the executive department because it is charged with the administration of the law as economically and as efficiently as possible and it is not for the Congress to exert itself by deter-

mining the procedure by which the law shall be carried out.

The only way the Veterans' Administration can take over the hospitals to be closed by Secretary Johnson's order is by the enactment of this measure.

From the standpoint of national defense, from the standpoint of our legal and moral obligations to care for the veterans of this country, it is incumbent on the House of Representatives and the Senate to pass this bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, when I voted for the GI bill, I distinctly recall the expressed hope that adequate hospital and medical attention would be guaranteed our veterans for all time to come.

The hue and cry now being raised against this bill providing for more hospital beds is a sour note compared with what the country wanted to do for our boys during World War II.

I am voting for this measure because I am for every possible protection of our veterans. I want to see decent medical and hospital facilities offered to all of them.

For several years, I have tried to get Congress to authorize the construction of a veterans' hospital in Broome County, New York, my home district. Such an authorization should be in this bill today.

Situated equally distant from New York and Buffalo, the Triple Cities area is the most logical place for a veterans' hospital in up-State New York. It is the center of one of the largest industrial and farming communities in our State.

Thousands of veterans could find easy access to such a hospital and they and their visiting relatives would not be compelled to travel long distances to Bath, Utica, or other far-away points as they now do.

Yes, I am for expansion of the hospital-building program which from my observations has bogged down. It has certainly fallen far short of the high platitudes we preached at the time we passed the GI bill.

I regret to see the injection of politics brought into this fight. I sometimes wonder, if taking the veterans' part does not command more courage than to vote against him. It has come to the sad fact that a man takes his life in his hands if he talks for our veterans on the floor of this House.

Nevertheless, whatever the consequences, I intend to go to bat for the men who fought for America in all our wars just as long as I am in Congress.

DULUTH VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record in support of this veterans' hospital bill, H. R. 5965, which directs the Veterans' Administration to construct those veterans' hospital projects which were canceled by executive order in January 1949. These 16,000 additional hospital beds are needed by our veterans, and passage of this bill is in the best interests of the Nation. For this reason, it has my active and enthusiastic support.

I should mention that one of the hospital projects involved in this proposal

is the 200-bed Duluth Veterans' Hospital. This project was one of the casualties of the January 10, 1949, Executive order. Issuance of such an order was most unfortunate, and indicated a lack of understanding of our situation. I am convinced that had there been a more thorough investigation of local conditions and the obvious need for the Duluth project, the cancellation order would never have gone through.

I wish to discuss the need for the Duluth hospital, and in so doing, I will be presenting the justification for the passage of this bill. For the veterans' hospital situation in Duluth is not unique—the situation exists in many parts of the country, and what I say in support of the Duluth hospital is true with respect to those other canceled projects, be they located in Mississippi or California, in New York or Oregon.

What are the facts supporting the construction of the Duluth Veterans' Hospital?

First. The Duluth area is an isolated one as far as veterans' hospital facilities are concerned. The nearest veterans' hospital is located at Fort Snelling, Minneapolis, Minn., which is over 200 miles from the geographical center of the Duluth area, and is more than 300 miles from outlying parts of the area. This means that sick veterans and emergency cases are forced to travel from 200 to 300 miles, often over icy roads in blizzard conditions, to reach the Fort Snelling hospital. This is a 6- to 8-hour trip, which is most hazardous to emergency cases.

Second. The cost of transportation to the Fort Snelling hospital is heavy, amounts to \$75 in ambulance service from my home town of Chisholm. In this connection I might add that the Veterans' Administration allows only \$35 for such travel.

Third. Veterans' hospital facilities in the area are most inadequate and far below the national average. Duluth is the focal point for a wide trade area, including a population of more than 450,000, and an estimated World War I and World War II veteran population of more than 51,000. If you base the population served by the proposed Duluth Veterans' Hospital on transportation, time, and convenience, the area embraces a population of 1,000,000 persons and perhaps 100,000 veterans.

Even if the Duluth Veterans' Hospital is constructed, and taking the conservative estimate of 51,000 veterans served by said hospital, the ratio would still be only 1 hospital bed for every 275 veterans, as compared to the national ratio of 1 bed to every 132 veterans.

I will mention a significant fact regarding the contributions to the recent war effort made by this area which has been denied the benefit of a veterans' hospital. The northern section of the region—the Iron Range—contributed 20 percent of its male population to the armed forces during World War II, which is twice the national average of 10 percent. I will also mention that the battle casualties suffered by Iron Range servicemen was 4 percent of the total in the

armed forces as compared to the national average of 2 percent.

Fourth. There is not sufficient hospital beds to take care of the veterans of the area in either private hospitals or the nearest veterans' hospitals. Private hospitals in Duluth and the surrounding area are overcrowded and have long waiting lists. The Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital has long waiting lists, and even near-emergency cases are often forced to wait 2 weeks before admittance.

Fifth. Duluth is admirably situated as the site of a veterans' hospital. It has an excellent reputation as a health center and is blessed with cool invigorating summer weather and a bracing dry winter climate. The city is served by a network of excellent Federal, State, and county road systems, and is readily accessible to all points in the area by eight trunk-line railroads, as well as summer lake passenger service. Air service connections link Duluth to all points in the country.

Sixth. Duluth has adequate medical and nursing personnel to staff a 200-bed veterans' hospital. Recent studies show that the Duluth medical community is well situated to serve such an institution. Plenty of medical talent is available within a few minutes driving distance of the proposed site.

Seventh. The city of Duluth has already made heavy advance expenditures in preparation for construction of the hospital. The hospital site was furnished at no cost to the Federal Government, and over \$15,000 has already been spent for sewerage and water extensions alone.

Mr. Chairman, Duluth needs this veterans' hospital badly, just as the other parts of the country affected need their hospitals as proposed in this legislation.

The passage of this bill is necessary to provide better hospital and medical services for our ex-servicemen. They are not getting the services they need and deserve, and this bill is needed to provide proper facilities. H. R. 5965 has my unqualified endorsement, and I urge the House to vote its passage.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I was privileged to be one of the members of a bipartisan special subcommittee of our House Armed Services Committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, is chairman and of which subcommittee the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina was subcommittee chairman.

In our study and survey of military hospitals we journeyed to Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. In all these States we held public hearings and surveyed and inspected military hospitals. But, of course, in connection with this valuable trip and gathering the important information we did about the relationship of hospitalization for the military and their dependents, we also learned much of great value as to the Nation-wide problem of hospitalization for the veterans of our wars. At an early date I hope to be able to give you pertinent remarks on the subject of hospitalization for the military and for their dependents.

But, I repeat, this trip for you, my colleagues of this Congress, I feel, was of great value and placed in possession of all the Members thereof, both Democrats and Republicans, a fund of factual information, as well as giving the benefit, for you if you please, of traveling with and listening to and learning from the distinguished Surgeons General of the Armed Forces, to say nothing of hearing the testimony of distinguished men in military medicine and also distinguished men in private medicine. Therefore, we obtained at first-hand and at the grassroots level a Nation-wide glimpse of the hospital problem.

Yes; and it should be crystal clear that the problem of military hospitals and veterans' hospitals is closely related. Very closely, in fact. For instance, both are paid for and both are operated by reason of the expenditure of taxpayers' money. Economy, therefore, as well as efficiency and availability must be a byword of both the military and veterans' hospitalization program.

And, in like manner, where military hospitals are available with spare beds it is just not common sense, in either administration or expenditure of tax money, for there to be duplication of hospital facilities. Questions of jurisdiction should be resolved in favor of standardization and unification of policies and programs, but in no case at the expense of veterans themselves. There must be no claimed economy on paper, in figures, which economy, when put into practice, is taken out of and comes as a result of increased suffering, either mental or physical.

As the sickness of members of the military or of veterans is not a political or partisan matter, so one conclusion I came to on this Nation-wide trip is that there is plenty of room for closer coordination between various departments charged in the field of the care of the military and of veterans and of dependents entitled to hospital care. And this closer coordination between the military and the Veterans' Administration in this important field of human endeavor and in the performance of responsibilities should come forthwith.

The physical and mental health and safety of veterans and military members needing hospitalization must not suffer by reason of untoward delays or adjustments of policy or questions of jurisdiction. The physical and mental needs of active or retired military personnel and their dependents, and the physical and mental needs of veterans are not subjects which tolerate untoward delays in administration.

Another conclusion I came to is that the present order of the Department of Defense closing or substantially closing several of the great military hospitals of our Nation removes the availability of hospital beds and treatment so far away from several centers of large population where those entitled thereto reside that it, in effect, removes hospital beds from being available.

Granting that the present congressional policy only makes hospitalization for military dependents available as a

duty of government when and if beds are available, nevertheless it is clear to me that over a term of many, many years the people of the Nation have made it clear in actual practice that military dependents shall not be eliminated from reasonable care in military hospitals by making these hospitals so far removed from where these military dependents reside that they are deprived from finding beds which are available. I believe the records will show that hundreds of thousands of military dependents have purchased homes and set up for the last years of their lives by locating close enough to military hospitals throughout the Nation to find these military hospital beds available. If, therefore, these military hospitals are to remain closed; if, therefore, the Veterans' Administration is to take over any or all of these great military hospitals, then the military dependents should not be foreclosed from their reasonable medical care as military dependents. Provision should be made to carry out the representations and assurances which have been made to active military personnel in this connection beginning before the Civil War.

On this Nation-wide trip the evidence at all our public hearings clearly showed that the private hospitals in all these large centers of population were already overcrowded. The evidence showed in some of the large cities that patients who were ready, able, and willing to pay from \$14 to \$25 a day for a private room in many cities had to wait from 2 weeks to 2 months to get such rooms; and, in like cities, those who could not afford private rooms but could only afford hospitalization in wards, could, in some cases, not obtain services for as much as 3 months. In like manner, these private hospitals, generally speaking, were not only overcrowded but overfilled at present; but there were no adequate programs revealed to the subcommittee indicating that these communities were going to be able to meet their own hospitalization needs as to private hospitals.

The uncontroverted evidence clearly showed the testimony before us—from distinguished men in active practice of private medicine—proved that private medicine and private hospitals increasingly depended upon the military and veterans' hospitals in their communities continuing in full force and effect.

In some places the continuance of the military hospitals determined the future of the private hospitals to some extent; and in one State the question of whether or not the military hospital continued would determine the question of whether or not the college of medicine of the State university could function as a qualified college of medicine.

I am sorry to have to state that I believe I recognize in the remarks of some of the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken before me a sort of a partisan or political attack or criticism upon the President of the United States or upon the administration. But hospitalization of veterans and military personnel is certainly not a matter of partisanship or of campaign material to build up a record

for or against political parties or political candidates. As human suffering knows no party lines or political parties, so no mental thought nor spoken words should be put on so low a level as partisanship or party politics or campaign speeches. No doubt you of the opposite political party in this House have noted that I, a Democrat, do not hesitate to urge correction and improvement in hospital administration and policies.

I shall vote for H. R. 5965 which provides for the construction of 16,000 additional hospital beds to be under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, even though it only provides for an additional 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital in my native State of California. Noting that the bill provides for specific geographical locations and sites for these hospitals, I feel the bill should be amended so that the particular locations, types or numbers of hospitals to be constructed in any certain geographical area should be left up to the wise discretion of the Veterans' Administration itself. My very informative Nation-wide trip with the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, recently, constrains me to state that it is clear to me that location of hospital beds should be related to the problem of each geographic area; the need of types of beds in certain geographical areas; as well as the absolute need of locating these hospitals as nearly as may be adjacent to available expert consultation service by distinguished men practicing private medicine. In order to increase the hospital service with expert consultation, advice, and skills, these hospitals must be located within reasonable proximity to medical colleges, schools, universities, and where groups of these experts practice private medicine. In like manner, hospitals should be built within reasonable proximity to the homes and firesides of military personnel and of veterans throughout the United States. The uncontroverted testimony before our Armed Services Subcommittee on this Nation-wide trip proved conclusively that patients who were able to have visits from their wives and sweethearts and other members of their family recover more quickly than those who do not. This means, therefore, that over a term of years hundreds of millions of dollars are thus saved by patients recovering more quickly than otherwise because they are hospitalized where available to have the morale building of frequent visits from their loved ones. I am not offering this amendment at this time because I understand that such amendment is to be offered. I shall vote for such amendment. I urge you, my colleagues, to vote for it.

My native State is California; my home city is Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif. I am convinced from the records furnished me by distinguished hospital leaders amongst the veteran groups of the VFW, American Legion, AMVETS, especially, that the present veterans' hospital facilities in California are not adequate to meet the problem that even presently exists.

For instance, the California Department Commanders Council, sitting at

Los Angeles, Calif., on January 21, 1950, sent me word, as follows:

Thousands of California veterans are today unable to gain admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals for treatment of tuberculosis, mental diseases, numerous medical and surgical ailments.

This commanders council is made up of the respective hospitalization chairmen of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of the American Legion, of Disabled American Veterans, of the American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—of the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

And just several months ago I received, from Alvin F. Kime, department commander, VFW, a statement, as follows:

We have 7 Veterans' Administration hospitals in the State with a capacity of 11,332 beds; also 8 Army and Navy and 4 private hospitals under contract to the Veterans' Administration with a capacity of 1,692 beds. Of the 11,332 beds, 3,388 are domiciliary beds. I find there is a waiting list of 735 non-service-connected cases at this time of which 29 are general medical, 174 are tubercular, and 539 are NP (mental). I also learned that we have over 1,900 NP patients who are veterans in the State mental hospitals. Simple analysis indicates a need of 3,500 beds over and above the Veterans' Administration's present capacity. We also find a large number of patients are out on furloughs from the hospitals, many of which may again need hospitalization. There are over 1,000 NP or mental patients being treated in Veterans' Administration clinics in addition to those hospitalized. The Veterans' Administration reports that there are no service-connected cases on any waiting list. New hospitals proposed in this State will provide 2,000 NP beds and 450 general medical beds plus 249 tubercular beds in addition to existing hospitals at Livermore and San Fernando. In my opinion we need at least 15,000 beds for all purposes in the State of California.

And a few months ago I also received from Lewis S. Sloneker, director of rehabilitation of the American Legion, Department of California, Los Angeles, Calif., a statement, in part, as follows:

This is true because the Federal Government is not assuming its responsibility of caring for the sick and disabled veteran. . . .

Some important people in Washington are advocating that the Federal Government curtail its responsibility to the veteran, while others order cut-backs in construction of badly needed hospitals previously approved by every branch of the Federal Government concerned. These same people at the same time of shirking their responsibility to the very men and women who made it possible for our Nation to remain free, are supporting expenditures of large amounts of our taxpayers' money for foreign relief throughout the world. Some of this money is going to our former enemies who caused so many of our own to be sick, disabled, and in need of hospital and medical care today. We do not intend to stand idly by and see our veterans suffering while our former enemies are cared for with our taxpayers' dollars.

In Los Angeles County alone, during the year 1948, there were a total of 953 veterans before the courts. Of this number, 248 were alcoholics. There were 110 dismissed, 418 committed to State hospitals, 235 committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 117 to supervision. In other words, 24% percent were committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals, 43% percent committed to State hospitals, 18% percent placed on supervision of the court, and 12% percent dismissed.

And, now, a word as to the great naval hospital at Long Beach, Los Angeles County. This magnificent facility was also ordered closed by the Department of Defense. At the date of the order, there were 400 veterans contract beds and the Veterans' Administration had asked for 200 additional beds. Excepting for the establishment of naval clinics in the area, this order will force military personnel and military dependents in the Long Beach, Los Angeles County, area to travel at least 90 miles by automobile or bus to Oceanside, Calif., where, at present, is only a one-story, war-built, firetrap, wooden barracks-type hospital facility.

Several weeks ago Veterans' Administrator Gray, with engineers, personally inspected this great Long Beach Navy Hospital and have informed me that they found the fireproof part of this great hospital entirely satisfactory for veterans' use, but that they could not use the wooden wings. That is understandable. And I concluded from my Nation-wide trip, also, that it was too dangerous a risk to take with any man in the military or military dependents or veterans to place them in one-story, war-built, wooden shacks for hospitalization purposes. Yet one effect of this order of the Secretary of Defense will unconsciously do this very thing.

As to the veterans in California, both present and to come in the future, the evidence clearly proves that the veterans population in California is increasing more rapidly than State veterans population in any other State. This being the case, it seems to me that, not only in California, but in every other State, due and adequate consideration must forthwith be given to the proposition that the military and the veterans must get their joint efforts together to the end that the maximum use of Federal hospital property and Federal money must be had in the interests of hospitalization of the earliest possible date.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I heartily favor the passage of this legislation. In fact, I have introduced a practically identical bill. These hospital beds are desperately needed. I know particularly of the great need for a hospital for mental cases for veterans in the area in which I reside. In this bill there is a provision for a mental hospital at Gainesville, Fla., which would relieve the present impossible situation in Florida. There is a long waiting list of mental cases in that area. Recently, I was able to secure hospitalization for a mental case which had been handled in the county jail for about 6 months. There are other cases almost as bad as that one and many on the waiting list for mental treatment and for treatment for other maladies. In order to solve the hospital situation in this area the Lake City hospital should be expanded, the proposed mental hospital at Gainesville should be built, and a new hospital should be established at Jacksonville for general medical and surgical treatment. Today in Florida we even have a waiting

list of emergency cases. It is impossible for a Congressman to explain to the people whom he represents why these hospitals have been turned down by the President. The people will certainly approve of this legislation, which represents a primary responsibility of the Nation to those who fought for their homeland in time of need. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is very necessary for the care of the veterans of our country. There have been authorized for construction in California two neuropsychiatric hospitals, one at San Francisco and one in southern California. Construction on neither of those hospitals has so far begun. I have endeavored to get a favorable reply concerning this matter of construction of these hospitals, but so far no definite assurance has been made.

I believe that every military hospital not being currently used, or if partially used, should be made available for use of veterans and placed under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Our hospital situation in this country is lagging for some reason. Personally, I feel that if the bill could be amended to provide for more hospitals in States like California, it would be much more in keeping. However, California has hospital bed accommodations for 7.74 out of each 1,000 veteran population in the State of California. That is inadequate. We do need further hospitals in California. I feel there should be some discretion, as far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, so that they could make changes in the location of some of the hospitals as to place and size. I believe that judgment will be exercised in the over-all program if left in the hands of the Administration to construct these hospitals. The bill is necessary. Thousands of men in my State are in need of hospitalization. I have endeavored to have a bill passed to establish a veterans' hospital which would take care of veterans in remote areas, where hospitalization is not accessible, thereby causing hardship to deserving veterans. Thus far I have been unsuccessful. I hope the Congress in its wisdom will some day recognize this inequality and provide further hospitalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

I would like to state that General Gray in his report to the Veterans' Affairs Committee had admitted to us that he had not authorized the cut-back of these hospitals; that it came from the White House. Both Admiral Booth and Surgeon General Bliss said that the Army and Navy hospitals were needed. I believe in taking the suggestions of the medical service.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to say a word about the Valley Forge General Hospital at Phoenixville, Pa., Pennsylvania today has 1,600,000 veterans who served in World Wars I and II. We have at Valley Forge a 1,900-bed hospital, 1,650 beds authorized built in 1943, at a cost of \$10,500,000. To duplicate these facilities today would cost, I would estimate, between forty and sixty million dollars. The cost per hospital bed is around \$22,000. We recently inspected this hospital. It is in excellent condition. It is greatly needed. To close it as anticipated would be a grave mistake. It is within 40 miles of Philadelphia, one of the great medical centers of the world, where specialists, consultants, and medical skill are available; yet in face of the desperate need for hospital beds with 2,700 veterans in Pennsylvania waiting hospitalization, the Veterans' Administration refused to take over this hospital built in 1943. It certainly is badly needed and the VA should be compelled to take it over. If this hospital and Murphy General Hospital at Boston are closed, the Walter Reed Hospital will be the only general hospital remaining open east of the Mississippi. Walter Reed Hospital is an 1,800-bed hospital with 2,000 patients and hundreds on the waiting list.

Now here are the facts concerning this much-needed institution: Valley Forge General Hospital:

Beds authorized.....	1,650
Designation of beds by specialty:	
(a) General medicine.....	425
(b) Hepatic-metabolic.....	70
(c) General and orthopedic surgery.....	700
(d) Plastic surgery.....	140
(e) Ophthalmologic surgery.....	100
(f) Closed-ward neuropsychiatric.....	165
(g) Open-ward neuropsychiatric.....	50

Valley Forge General Hospital has a threefold mission with respect to the furnishing of hospital care for military personnel, their dependents, and other personnel for whose medical care the Department of the Army is responsible. This threefold mission is:

Provision of station-type hospitalization—medical and surgical care for minor illnesses and injuries—for personnel on and in the immediate vicinity of the post of Valley Forge General Hospital.

Provision of regional-type hospital care—medical and surgical care for patients with complicated or obscure diagnoses for which station hospitals are not equipped and staffed—for post personnel and patients evacuated from station hospitals in the Second Army area.

Provision of highly specialized care for personnel including oversea evacuees with general medical conditions, hepatic-metabolic conditions, general and orthopedic surgical conditions, plastic-surgery conditions, ophthalmologic-surgical conditions, and neuropsychiatric conditions. The work load of Valley Forge General Hospital, in connection with the provision of this specialized care, is related to the world-wide strength of the Army and the Air Force and the number of beds authorized for the specific specialty. For example, Valley Forge General Hospital is authorized 100 beds for ophthalmologic

surgery with a total of 150 beds authorized in the entire Department of the Army hospital system. Valley Forge General Hospital, therefore, in effect, provides ophthalmologic surgery facilities for two-thirds of the entire strength of the Army and Air Force and receives two-thirds of all patients requiring ophthalmologic surgery in the Army and the Air Force.

In addition to the above mission, hospital care is furnished Veterans' Administration beneficiaries to the extent of the Veterans' Administration bed authorization of 175.

Keeping in mind the threefold mission of Valley Forge General Hospital and the relationship of the three aspects of the mission to strength served the following indicates the number of personnel furnished medical care by this installation:

- (a) Approximately 2,000 troops on or in the immediate vicinity of the post are provided station-type hospital care.
- (b) Approximately 97,000 troops are provided regional type hospital care.
- (c) Approximately 75,000 oversea troops are provided general medical and surgical care in addition to those being provided regional type care.
- (d) Approximately 1,046,000 troops are provided hepatic-metabolic care.
- (e) Approximately 890,000 troops are provided plastic surgery care.
- (f) Approximately 700,000 troops are provided ophthalmologic surgical care.
- (g) Approximately 110,000 troops are provided neuropsychiatric care.

So the need to maintain this hospital is evident.

I might also add that we have been sending to private hospitals in Pennsylvania, veterans requiring hospitalization and recently several of them were sent to a mental sanatorium in Pennsylvania, and two of them were burned to death. They were mental cases.

Yet we have this hospital available with 1,900 beds, with only 1,400 occupants, and they will not admit veterans needing hospitalization. Some action should be taken by the Congress to compel the Veterans' Administration to take over these hospitals which are so greatly needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that some of the hospitals are not suitable for mental cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has consumed all of her time.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is that many States, including my own, have a much higher number of veterans per hospital bed than the national average. There the need for additional hospital facilities is an aggravated and a pressing one. The fact is that veterans have been detained in jails because of a lack of hospital facilities. Many Members of Congress, and I am

one of them, have first hand knowledge of this in our efforts to help sick veterans.

Correction of these conditions is long overdue. I think they may not be corrected unless the Congress takes the matter in its own hands. I strongly urge the passage of this act in order to secure that needed correction and assure more adequate care for veterans who need and are entitled to hospitalization.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman. The veterans of Oklahoma took one of the largest, if not the largest cut in hospital beds allocated to any State in the Union in this 16,000 bed cut—which this resolution seeks to reinstate. One 750-bed neuropsychiatric hospital was completely canceled, and the 750-bed general medical hospital at Oklahoma City was reduced to 500 beds.

Its sorely needed 750-bed neuropsychiatric hospital, scheduled for construction at Norman was canceled by the order. Approximately \$2,000,000 in the value of the site is available at Norman including all utilities, since the large site is a portion of the formal Naval Air Technical Training Center still owned by the Government but not now used.

Another \$700,000 in plans and designs was lost by the Presidential directive holding up this hospital. Thus, although construction work had not actually started—a sum amounting to \$2,700,000 is being lost through cancellation of this project.

The reason given in the directive for the cancellation of this hospital as in other cases, was that it could not be properly staffed and that additional beds were not needed.

This certainly does not apply to the Oklahoma hospitals—and particularly not to the Norman neuropsychiatric hospital. High officials of the Veterans' Administration now admit:

First. That the hospital can be properly staffed with skilled physicians, psychiatrists, technicians, and other hospital attendants. Since it is located adjacent to the University of Oklahoma and to the State's largest mental hospital, the Central State Hospital, the finest specialists in the Middle West are available to service this installation.

Second. There is an acute need for more beds for the mentally ill veterans of Oklahoma. Even the Budget Bureau admits this as well as the Veterans' Administration. There are only 39 emergency beds for the nonviolent cases in the general medical hospitals for veterans in the entire State. All Oklahoma veterans must be treated at Little Rock, Ark., 330 miles distant; or at Topeka, Kans., 280 miles distant; or at Waco, Tex., 375 miles distant. At present there are 580 Oklahoma veterans hospitalized in these out-of-State hospitals.

Thus, the claim that the hospitals cannot be staffed—and that additional beds are not needed—cannot be properly lodged against the Oklahoma projects.

This cancellation reduces the number of beds scheduled for Oklahoma from 1,500 to a mere 500. In fact, the net in-

crease over present facilities will be only 280 beds, since the new 500-bed general medical hospital at Oklahoma City will close a temporary fire-trap veterans' hospital at Will Rogers Air Field of 220 beds.

This increase of 500 hospital beds will be expected to handle a gigantic increase in veteran population over World War I and World War II. The veteran population has increased from 57,000 to 297,000 or 214 percent. Our present bed ratio per veteran is 490; the fourth highest ratio in the Nation.

These two Oklahoma hospital projects are ideal sites, the need is great, and there are ample medical specialists ready and available to properly staff them. They should be reinstituted at the earliest possible time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that all the arguments in opposition to this measure have been answered. This measure should be passed without a dissenting vote.

So far as politics is concerned, I desire to say that I never heard the word "politics" mentioned with reference to this bill until I heard it on this floor today. It is not a political measure; it is a measure by which we are attempting to take care of our disabled veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule the bill is considered as read, and no amendment is in order except amendments offered by the committee.

Has the committee any amendment to offer to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The committee has no amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Are pro forma amendments in order to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is in order except those offered by the committee.

Under the rule the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. STIGLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5905) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 348, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEARNEY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Veterans' Administration shall make a survey of abandoned Army and Navy hospitals and include in its program those it is possible to utilize."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the motion just adopted, I report the bill back with the amendment and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add a new section:

"Sec. 2. The Veterans' Administration shall make a survey of the abandoned Army and Navy hospitals and include in its program those that it is possible to utilize."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that such a motion can be made by the gentleman from Mississippi in view of the fact that the committee has had no meeting?

The SPEAKER. This is a forthwith motion. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT RELATING TO THE WATERS OF THE CANADIAN RIVER BY THE STATES OF OKLAHOMA, TEXAS, AND NEW MEXICO

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3482) granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "from the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday last the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] had 48 minutes of debate remaining on chapter IV.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed fitting that Americans should observe and take part in the inspirational activities which accompany Arbor Day. In the days of "wars and rumors of wars" we are too apt to give more attention to the days which remind us of destruction. Arbor Day is a mighty instrument of peace because it rightfully stresses "growth through God."

History records that Arbor Day was first given State-wide emphasis in Nebraska through the efforts of J. Sterling Morton—a Nebraskan—and one of the early Secretaries of Agriculture. As a Nebraskan, I am proud that this day of peace had its origin in my home State through the efforts of a fellow Nebraskan. But, I am also aware that the beauty and power of the message of Arbor Day is not confined to a single date—April 10, 1872—when the Nebraska State legislature made it a Nebraska official holiday. Every pioneer, every son of the soil, carried Arbor Day in his heart long before J. Sterling Morton gave it life. Johnny Appleseed and his nameless brethren believed in this day and labored ceaselessly that the wilderness should produce and that the desert should blossom.

In these days of the A- and H-bombs, in these days of the terrible threat of the antichrist of the Kremlin, it is well to remember that Arbor Day holds the full promise of peace. The planting of seeds and seedlings is a symbol of the story of the wrestling of Hiawatha and Mondamin—where Mondamin was buried only to rise again as life-giving corn. Arbor Day holds an even deeper significance. It is a repetition of the message of Good Friday and Easter.

By sharing in the observances of Arbor Day we place ourselves on the eternal record as patriots of peace who dare, even in these troublous times, to advocate national prosperity and international sanity by "growth through God."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 5, noes 107.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my membership on the subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office appropriations handling this phase of the omnibus bill, proud of our chairman, proud of my colleagues on the subcommittee, and proud of our clerk, Mr. Sprinkle. I am also proud of our handiwork. Last Friday, when the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] presented this phase of the bill to the House, I heard many fine compliments paid him from our side of the aisle. I know they were well merited. The chairman of our committee, a true southern gentleman, is courteous, refined, and tolerant, and brings to our committee many capabilities. I know of his devotion to his assignment. He inspires cooperation and teamwork and, as he said last Friday, it is rare in our committee that we experience any division.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times said Wednesday that the resignation of John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, was imminent. I hope this is not so. And I say this because I believe him to be one of the best-equipped and most able members of the President's Cabinet. He is characterful and he is honest and he has proven to me that he is anxious to save our country from bankruptcy. I think that he has been a stabilizer in the councils of the President and I think it would be most unfortunate for those councils to lose his services at this time. However, if he does become president of the New York Stock Exchange or president of a large western banking enterprise as rumored, I wish him well.

I was chairman of this Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations in the Eightieth Congress when our committee effected certain cuts and instituted a real shake-up in various bureaus of the Treasury Department under Secretary Snyder—notably the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Customs, and the Coast Guard of the United States. The Secretary told our committee this year that these shake-ups were wholesome and in the interest of good government and the taxpayers of the United States. I was proud to hear him relate along with George J. Schoeneman,

the able Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, how that Bureau during the last year had saved 1,000,000 man-hours, and how further savings were to be expected as the result of our committee's work. The Secretary also told us that most of the recommendations of the management survey of customs instituted by our committee had been put into effect saving some few millions. He added that progress was continuing and that more modern procedures in rendering better service to the public were fast being carried out step by step. In 1947, our committee called upon the Ebasco Services, Inc., to review the deficiencies in the Coast Guard and as a result some 200 recommendations for improvement were made, 120 of which have been carried out up to this writing.

I like to tell the facts concerning the action of the Eightieth Congress respecting the Bureau of Customs budget because to me it is a Saturday Evening Post story and emphasizes more than any other story the difficulties that may be experienced by any Congress when it is determined to effect real economies in the interest of the taxpayers of the United States and runs up against a bureaucrat who is determined that the fat in his request shall not be touched. Our subcommittee in 1947 cut the Bureau of Customs' request for some \$36,000,000 by less than 10 percent, whereupon the then Commissioner of Customs furloughed or fired 80 percent of all the guards along our borders and at our ports of entry. All up and down the land newspapers described the crime and governors and mayors wired their Congressmen to save America from dangerous smuggling. The Treasury-Post Office bill containing the cut, which was passed by the House by a record vote of 387 to 0, was pending before the Senate when the Commissioner of Customs did his job. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures, went into action. In no time, most of the men furloughed or fired were back at their posts and one night, as I was working in my office here on Capitol Hill, I heard a knock on the door. Standing at the entrance was the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder. He told me he had come to express regret over what had been done regarding the Customs cut. He said he believed the Bureau could live happily on the budget and he was removing the Commissioner of Customs from his post and giving him a minor assignment in the Bureau. I suggested that he see Senator AIKEN at once, because it was my understanding that the Senator was coming out with a report calling for the dismissal of the Commissioner of Customs. The Secretary did see Senator AIKEN. No action was taken looking toward dismissal, but Mr. Frank Dow, a career man in the service, was made Acting Commissioner.

A management survey was made of the Customs Service which reoriented and improved its services tremendously and the sequence of the story is this—in 1948, when the Secretary of the Treasury sent his new request for funds

to the committee, the amount was \$500,000 below the amount allowed by our committee the prior year when all the trouble was caused. It is conceded everywhere that this, perhaps, was the most notorious attempt in American history to ruin the efforts of a Congress anxious to do a real job for the taxpayers of our country. It failed in part because of the determination of an honest Secretary of the Treasury to cooperate with our committee and the Congress.

Now a word about another very important bureau in the Treasury Department—the Bureau of Narcotics, captained by one of the most able and devoted public servants I know, Dr. Harry J. Anslinger.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I was interested in what the gentleman said about the Customs Service, which it seemed to me at the time, and still does, was a piece of political trickery. I wonder if the gentleman sees any analogy between that and the recent order curtailing the postal service.

Mr. CANFIELD. If the gentleman will permit, I will come to that a little later in my presentation.

In 1948, I was concerned about an increase in heroin addiction in New Jersey, especially in the Newark and Camden areas. I discussed the situation with Dr. Anslinger, who informed me that he would like to send agents abroad to strike at the source of this murderous narcotic, particularly in Istanbul, which in the underworld is termed the "heroin capital of the world." I discovered that the Bureau of Narcotics was precluded by the Bureau of the Budget from asking additional funds for such a purpose and I moved to add \$16,000 to the Bureau's appropriation to see what could be done. The results were startling dividends, which came not only to my State of New Jersey but to the whole United States and to other countries. Listen to what these alert and hard-working narcotic agents accomplished with \$16,000:

An agent was sent to Istanbul. With the approval of the Turkish police, he went underground and worked his way into one of the principal gangs smuggling heroin into the United States, Canada, and Egypt. When he gave the signal for the police to close in, a clandestine heroin plant was seized and 30 tough gangsters went to Turkish prisons for long terms.

An agent was sent to Marseilles, France, and succeeded in working into the confidence of a vicious band of smugglers sending their poison to the United States and other countries. With the help of the French Surete, arrests followed and another gang went to French prisons.

An agent was sent to Iran, where overproduction of opium is rampant. This opium in the form of Iranian sticks is smuggled to many countries. He obtained a declaration from the Iran Government that they would no longer sell opium to the Far East, a principal point of diversion of Persian opium to the United States. He obtained valuable in-

formation which was used in concluding an interim agreement at Ankara in December 1949, whereby Turkey, Yugoslavia, Iran, and India agreed to limit opium production to the medical needs of the world.

The United States had been rid of cocaine addiction for 20 years. Suddenly, about 1946, a flood of cocaine reached into every city in this country. Here in the Nation's Capital cocaine addiction mounted and crime rose parallel with its abuse. An agent was sent to Peru and found 18 cocaine factories operating and sending, through the underground, this crime-inciting and death-dealing narcotic to the United States and to other countries. The Peruvian Government closed the 18 factories and in New York, the principal smuggler, Eduardo Balarezo, a prominent Peruvian revolutionary figure and his murderous gang were sent to long terms in the penitentiary. Thus was removed the threat of the worst crime wave ever to threaten this country and cocaine addiction has again virtually disappeared.

When Secretary Snyder was before our committee this year, I asked him what he thought about the Bureau's accomplishments with the \$16,000 our committee gave it over and above the budget request. I said:

Mr. Secretary, did it not pay dividends?

And his answer was this:

Mr. CANFIELD. I will say it did. I can tell you that some of the captures never would have been made if Dr. Anslinger had not had that extra money. It could not have been done.

With Chairman GARY, I disagree with the action of our subcommittee on one very important item and that is the item dealing with the United States Coast Guard Reserve. The President and the Bureau of the Budget asked for \$4,100,000 to activate the Reserve at this time, their request emphatically endorsed by Defense Secretary Louis Johnson. Our subcommittee did not approve. I have prepared an amendment, which the chairman will support, calling for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for this purpose, the Coast Guard having agreed with me that a real job can be done with this money. When I present the amendment, may I say humbly, I believe I will be able to present a case which will warrant the unanimous approval of the House as being in the best interests of our national defense.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment is in line with the needs of national defense as set out by the heads of the Defense Department?

Mr. CANFIELD. It is, and I am very glad to note that it is going to have the support of the gentleman from Texas, who has a background of experience in Reserve matters. It is distinctly in the interest of national defense.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the gentleman. If he will yield just a moment further, it is quite true that I can under-

stand the benefits of it to the individual trainee under any Reserve program, having been a militiaman for a long, long time; but there is another angle which I wish to touch on. When the gentleman's amendment comes up I expect to speak in behalf of it and show a very striking example of the need for the amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am aware of what the example is, and I look forward to the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I wish to say to the gentleman that for the last 4 or 5 years my service has been continuously on the subcommittee on the Coast Guard, and for a while I had the honor of being chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of that committee. While I do not know all the answers to Coast Guard problems, at least I have made some study of them.

The gentleman's amendment is amply justified and I trust it will have the support of this committee. I shall join with the gentleman from Texas, my distinguished colleague on the committee, in supporting this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. The Members of the House know of the gentleman's services in behalf of the Coast Guard. I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to support the gentleman's Coast Guard amendment, but I would like to ask one question: Does the gentleman intend during the course of his remarks to touch upon the question of whether or not the cut in postal service was justified?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not true that both the Secretary of Defense and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy Department urge that this appropriation be granted to meet Coast Guard requirements?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. This Coast Guard Reserve is a vital part of the national defense.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS. The question that arises in my mind and the minds of some others is whether this \$1,000,000 is going to do the job.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I talked with the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard this morning. He is the one who suggested the million-dollar program; and I may add that the amendment was prepared by him and his advisers.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I wish to agree in the gentleman's statement about the necessity for the Coast Guard Reserve. It is most apparent and has been most apparent that it is necessary to protect and defend and keep strong the national

defense of this country. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made that he intends to offer the amendment. At the proper time I hope I may be permitted to speak on the amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. He is a true and tried friend of the Coast Guard.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman said that the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard had said that the \$1,000,000 was adequate to start the program.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. PASSMAN. Why, then, did they ask for \$4,000,000 in the justification?

Mr. CANFIELD. I cannot answer that question, but I do know that the Guard is satisfied with \$1,000,000.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I should like to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Louisiana. The officials of the Coast Guard said that the \$4,000,000 was necessary for the Reserve program to be carried on properly, but that rather than get nothing they were willing to take \$1,000,000 to get the program started.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I wish to commend the gentleman for the position that he has taken and to state that in my opinion his action is in the interest of the security of America. It will mean an ultimate saving of many dollars.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I suggest to my distinguished friend the gentleman from New Jersey that to some extent he explain exactly what is expected to be done with the \$4,100,000 requested to set up this Coast Guard Reserve program.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from New York I am prepared to go into that when I present the amendment, but because of my limited time and the many other things I wish to touch upon in this important bill I cannot devote further time to this now. Furthermore, there are some members of the subcommittee who wish to speak, and debate has been limited, under the 2-hour rule. I want to accommodate committee members with time under my control.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. In the justification there was, as pointed out, a request for \$4,000,000 to start the program. Was there an indication in the testimony or elsewhere as to what the annual cost of the program would be once it is launched?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. COUDERT. What is the amount?

Mr. CANFIELD. The figure is \$8,000,000.

Regarding the appropriations for the Post Office Department, I desire to read part of my examination of Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson:

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Donaldson, you tell us, in response to a question of the chairman, that the Bureau of the Budget cut your 1951 request by \$42,000,000. In your statement you discuss expansions of service, and you indicate that they will be kept at a minimum.

However, you go on to say:

"The continuation of building activities results in increased service demand, and continuous adjustments of service are necessary to meet the changed conditions in urban areas and in the field of transportation."

Does the cut of the Bureau of the Budget prejudice in any way your plans for normal expansion?

Mr. DONALDSON. No, sir. I had particular reference to the fact that there is considerable building going on yet in large centers and in suburban areas, to which we will have to extend service.

I do not think the Post Office Department should refuse to extend service where it is absolutely essential, but I meant that we should not embark on some program that would cost additional money, which was not essential or necessary.

If the receipts that have been estimated for 1951 are as much as the estimate, then the deficit will remain in accordance with the estimate, provided costs are not cut.

I do not propose to curtail the service to the public in order to reduce the deficit. I do not think that is good or logical. But I do think that if there are some suggestions made for expanding the postal service, some new field, or something of that kind, that that ought to await a time when the financial condition of the postal service is in better balance.

I do not mean to infer, Mr. CANFIELD, that this is going to result in any curtailment of service to the public. I think I did infer that if it was further cut, that might happen, because this ties us down to a limitation upon what our receipts will be, plus the amount of deficit they set up.

This is the first time this has happened. In other words, the receipts are estimated at a certain figure. The total expenditures are estimated by the total of these appropriation items. The total appropriation is the receipts plus the estimated deficit.

If the receipts fall below the figure set for receipts, and then we are still held to the amount of the deficit as set up in the budget, that will mean curtailment of service, unless, of course, we come before the Congress and ask for deficiency appropriations.

Then there would be an opportunity to do that.

Later in the hearings, I examined Mr. Vincent C. Burke, Deputy Postmaster General as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Donaldson said yesterday:

"Expansions of service will be kept at a minimum. However, the continuation of building activities results in increased service demands. Continuous adjustments of service are necessary to meet the changed conditions in the urban areas, and in the field of transportation."

I assume from that that when our colleagues on the floor are reviewing the bill and they ask questions pertaining to normal expansions in urban areas, we will be able to tell them that they were in contemplation when these requests were made?

Mr. BURKE. Definitely. We propose to take care of those normal expansions, Mr. CANFIELD. As a matter of fact it is a must. We just cannot leave people without postal service because they have built up a new residential suburb or a new group of apartment

houses which has extended the city for miles beyond the previously existing limits. We follow through, and we propose to do that. You would expect us to do that, I am sure.

Mr. CANFIELD. If perchance during the year some unusual situation develops, you know that as in the past we are always ready to have you come down here and tell us your story and then the committee does what is right.

Mr. BURKE. You have always been very considerate and cooperative toward the Post Office Department in all cases.

Inasmuch as the actual cut effected by our committee was less than 1 percent, I am at a loss to understand why the Post Office Department now feels obliged to cut certain delivery service from 25 to 50 percent. I am mindful of the heroic efforts the Postmaster General has been making to get the Congress of the United States to revise upward the postal rate structure so as to remove unnecessary subsidies and I have been surprised that the Hoover Commission in reviewing the problems of the Post Office Department stayed clear of this No. 1 problem that has so much to do with the terrific postal deficit we face this year.

There is another very important fact that has not been developed so far in the presentation of this chapter of the bill and it is this: The President and the Bureau of the Budget, acting on the belief that the Post Office Department had overestimated its requirements for the fiscal year 1951, cut the Department's requests by \$42,000,000. In other words, the President and the Bureau of the Budget felt that the Department's figures on anticipated volume were too high. In all the publicity incident to the cuts in service no mention has been made of this.

In our committee discussions I made it clear that I was opposed to any cuts that would reduce mail deliveries. Rapid communications in America is admittedly one of the reasons for our great progress. Surveys made in New Jersey over the week end indicate that housewives are resentful over reduction of residential delivery service and many are contending that they are due to foreign spending. Some point out that the British are proud of their mail delivery service which, they contend, is subsidized in part by American funds.

Frankly, I feel that if the Post Office Department insists on carrying out its program, the appropriations for foreign aid will be prejudiced.

I surmise that the Postmaster General hopes that the other body will soon pass the pending measure to increase postal rates and, this being done, will revise the order now causing so many complaints.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to say to the gentleman that he will be joined in the conviction, which I gather is voiced from the gentleman's experience, that the responsibility for these cuts, which have been very distressing in my district, must be placed on the executive department, and apparently is not the responsibility here of what the Congress itself has done, which certainly has not been material enough, as the gentleman

so truly demonstrated, to bring about what the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Hoover Commission itself said was an unnecessarily drastic result.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Following that comment by the gentleman from New York, as I understood the gentleman's statement, the cuts to which he is now referring relate to fiscal 1951.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is, the financial cuts.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The service which the Postmaster General is curtailing is paid for from funds out of 1950 appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. When the Postmaster General was before the gentleman's committee discussing the appropriation for 1951—and that was only a comparatively few days ago—did he then say anything about this proposed curtailment of service?

Mr. CANFIELD. He did not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Has he yet made any complaint or asked for any deficiency in order to maintain the service?

Mr. CANFIELD. Insofar as I know, he has not, and he has not availed himself of the invitation repeatedly extended him by our committee to come down with his aides and take his hair down over any extraordinary need that develops, or to discuss with us any deficiency of funds in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad to have that statement, in view of the fact that either Friday or Saturday night former Assistant Postmaster General Paul Aiken is reported to have made a statement in Denver that the reason the Postmaster General had to cut these deliveries was due to the fact that Congress had not given him enough money.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I ask the gentleman this question? Did Mr. Aiken, perchance, discuss the \$42,000,000 cut imposed on the Department by the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Probably not.

Mr. CANFIELD. No; he did not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But I would like to have the gentleman from New Jersey make a direct statement as to whether or not these curtailed services are due to any lack on the part of the Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. They are not.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Postmaster General did appear before the committee, however, and did point out to us that he was running into a tremendous deficit and that something drastic would have to be done unless this bill, raising some of these rates, was passed.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That bill passed the House but did not pass the other body.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. In view of what the gentleman just said, I would like to read to him and to the membership a feature story on the first page of a newspaper in Massachusetts, the Springfield News, of last Wednesday. The headline reads, "Mail service cut—Blame put squarely on Congress by high post-office official."

The subheadline is as follows: "Assistant Postmaster General Walter Myers, here for conference, warns Department cannot carry added expenses; says spending slashed."

The full text of the article reads:

A high postal official today placed the blame for the Post Office Department's curtailment of service squarely on the shoulders of Congress in explaining a new move to reduce operating costs.

The blast came from Walter Myers, Assistant Postmaster General, who is attending an all-day program at the Red Barn in Chicopee with western Massachusetts and Worcester postmasters.

Hitting sharply at the House and Senate, Mr. Myers pointed out that the Post Office budget has been so seriously sliced that the Department has had to adopt a program of very strict economy.

"Contrary to popular belief," he told the Daily News, "the Post Office Department has never overspent in any of its activities."

He pointed out that top officials have had to go in for very strict economy in spending, which means certain types of services must be reduced to a minimum.

Admitting that postal salaries have gone up during the past few years, the Assistant Postmaster General denied that it is the Department which is responsible.

"Congress had the power to raise salaries and not the Post Office Department," he flatly declared. "We are but an agency which must go along with the law as it is prescribed."

He predicted that the Department would work on a \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 deficit for 1951.

He said, as an example, that second class mail is being handled by the Department at a terrific loss and added, "Congress has failed to raise the rates so we could realize a greater increase in revenue from such operations."

Mr. Myers doubted whether an increase in rates would clear away the huge deficit, but said, "Every little bit helps and there are many more instances where more revenue could be had if Congress would consider acting in the right direction."

"Rates on various mail services have not changed in the past 25 years," the Assistant Postmaster General stated. "We must pay for heat, lighting, and other maintenance costs of our thousands of buildings, many of which are housed by private companies." There again, he pointed out, the law specifically states that the Post Office Department shall shoulder the costs.

"The postal organization has conducted a curtailment program and not a spending program." Mr. Myers said, "Our budget was cut by \$24,000,000 for this year by Congress and to offer the right type of service, the Department had to cut here and there to tighten up spending."

"There is a definite need for improvements in the department, but the lack of financial

assistance has hampered us," he said. "We need trucks and we are replacing some on the long-range program."

He said the Department also lacked building facilities in larger cities, and again hit at Congress because no appropriations have been made to handle the problem. "There is absolutely no indication that Congress will give us any building program money," he said.

As for Springfield, Mr. Myers labeled the local post office as "inadequate" for the size of the city and the amount of work being handled locally.

I sent a message to Mr. Myers on Friday, calling his attention to the headlines and to the text, and quoted the first part of the article. I requested, if possible, to have the full text of his speech. Mr. Myers called my office today and quoted to my secretary from certain notes he had. He indicated that he would send the notes to me and has done so. I feel these notes should be placed in the Record at this point. They are as follows:

Reflecting the views of the country the Congress is interested in economy. You have doubtless seen in the newspapers today that mail deliveries in residential areas have been curtailed by the Postmaster General's order. If you read his order, you will note that he quotes from a report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House a recommendation that sizable savings might be made by reducing the number of deliveries, particularly in routes serving residential areas exclusively.

So the Postmaster General is making a good-faith effort to cooperate with the Congress in the interest of over-all economy. At the same time it is hoped that Congress will grant higher rates for second-, third-, and fourth-class matter so that the postal budget may more nearly be brought into balance.

Mr. Myers told my secretary that he did not really make a speech, but rather was speaking from these notes and quoting from the Postmaster General's order. He also said that it was not his intention that his remarks be considered a blast at Congress and that he was misquoted.

There is also a second news story in another Springfield, Mass., newspaper, the Union, in its issue of April 20. The headline reads as follows: "Avers Congress has asked cuts by post office—Assistant Postmaster General addresses western Massachusetts association."

The text is as follows:

Assistant Postmaster General Walter Myers of Washington told a gathering of 223 postmasters from western Massachusetts and Worcester County and their guests today at a meeting in the Red Barn that cut-back on personnel in post offices throughout the country is being effected as the result of a request from the House Committee on Appropriations to economize in the Post Office Department and to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover report.

INCLUDED ALL MEASURES

Mr. Myers explained that the Hoover Committee in its report included all the measures that have been under study in the Post Office Department for reducing expenses. He said that the proposal of the Hoover Committee to divide the Department into 10 to 12 postal districts is the only recommendation that will not be carried out.

In the past few years, the Assistant Postmaster General said, 50 postmasters of the largest post offices in the country have been

consulted on means of reducing mail handling costs. It was generally agreed, according to Myers, that deliveries to both homes and business places could be reduced in number without seriously curtailing mail-delivery service. He said that many firms reported that there were too many deliveries during a working day, often causing confusion in handling incoming goods. With many business offices closing on Saturday, it was found that fewer deliveries on Saturdays were needed.

DIFFICULT PROBLEM

The problem of reducing the forces in the local departments will be a difficult one, Myers reported. Under the present laws, many of the disabled veterans who have been hired recently will have precedence over personnel who have been in the Post Office service for 10 to 15 years when layoffs are made, he said. Postmasters received their postal bulletins today, Myers said, that will instruct them on procedure.

It will take a few months for each local department to study and work out the individual problems of reduction. The plan will be in full effect by July 1, the Assistant Postmaster General said.

Myers told the postmasters that the Department has been operating with a \$400,000,000 to \$550,000,000 annual deficit for the last few years. He said that at one time the deficit ran as high as 30 percent of the total Department budget, but it is less now.

In further commenting on the budget, Myers said that 96 percent of the Post Office operating expense is in salaries and transportation. By cutting deliveries it is expected that substantial savings can be made in the salary and transportation expenses.

I am not calling this to the attention of the gentleman and the membership in connection with the merit or lack of merit in the recent order issued by the Postmaster General. There certainly seems to be considerable confusion both here in Washington and among the public as to exactly what this order involves and as to the full reasons for or against the order or any parts of it. In that connection, however, I have seen a statement issued by the head of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report. It was issued as a press release on April 23, 1950, and as it has a definite bearing on this whole matter I believe it should be included at this point. It is as follows:

Robert L. Johnson, national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report, said today that the Nation-wide cut in postal services should have been preceded by congressional action on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for postal reorganization and economy. The Post Office Department on Tuesday ordered service reduced to one delivery a day for most postal users.

"The bipartisan Hoover Commission clearly showed the way to substantial savings in postal operations," Dr. Johnson, who is president of Temple University, said. "All told, the Commission's recommendations, if fully adopted and installed, could mean a reduction of over \$200,000,000 a year in the huge postal deficit of \$500,000,000. Moreover, by streamlining and modernizing the Post Office structure and equipment, the efficiency of its services would actually be improved.

"Since last July, a series of bills based on the Hoover report and endorsed by President Truman and Postmaster General Donaldson, has been before the Congress. Yet absolutely no affirmative action has been taken.

"For example, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has made no move on a majority of the recommendations and

has voted to postpone action indefinitely on the vital bill, S. 2213, to take the Post Office out of politics. The Hoover Commission distinctly pointed out that the lowered morale wrought by political appointment of postmasters was one of the basic causes of inefficiency in the Department.

"This measure was unanimously recommended by six Democrats and six Republicans of the Hoover Commission," Dr. Johnson said. "It has the support of President Truman and Postmaster General Donaldson, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, and the National League of District Postmasters. No witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill at subcommittee hearings. The committee members now have the opportunity to take statesmanlike action. The bill should be reconsidered and approved.

"I am at a loss to understand inactivity on this and other vital measures. Postmaster General Donaldson and the 400,000 hard-working postal employees will be constantly hampered by an obsolete organizational structure and by antiquated methods and equipment until the Congress acts. Meanwhile, Tuesday's action, causing hardship to thousands, highlights even more strongly the need for reform.

"In effect the Post Office is suffering from the chronic, wasting disease of inefficiency for which the Hoover Commission recommended concrete remedies and a healthful regimen. Sudden shock treatment is hardly the answer. Yet, inertia and reluctance to give up special privileges are keeping the patient from treatment."

Calling attention to other bills designed to modernize the Post Office Department, S. 2212, before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (companion bill, H. R. 5775, before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service)—a bill to provide for improved financial control over the operations of the Post Office Department—and S. 1431, before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (companion bill, H. R. 2908, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce)—a bill for the separation of subsidies paid to the air lines by the Post Office Department—Dr. Johnson urged prompt action on these measures to help cure the Post Office's ills.

Further steps now pending require passage to complete the Hoover Commission's recommendations for Post Office reform, Dr. Johnson said; one, a bill to permit adjustment of postal rates on penny postcards and special services on which the Post Office is currently losing money; and another, several portions of which would permit reorganization of the Post Office Department on a businesslike and regional basis.

The following news dispatch with reference to this statement follows:

HOOVER REPORT GROUP SCORES POSTAL CUTS (By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The citizens committee for the Hoover Report issued a statement today characterizing curtailment of postal services as sudden shock treatment that was hardly the answer to the Post Office Department's ills.

Tuesday's order to reduce most mail deliveries to one a day and otherwise cut expenses should have been preceded by congressional action on recommendations of the (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, it was asserted.

The comments were made by Robert L. Johnson, national chairman of the citizens committee, in a statement distributed by committee headquarters here. Dr. Johnson is president of Temple University, Philadelphia.

"The bipartisan Hoover Commission clearly showed the way to substantial savings in postal operations," he said. "All told, the commission's recommendations, if fully adopted and installed, could mean a reduction of over \$200,000,000 a year in the huge postal deficit of \$500,000,000. Moreover, by streamlining and modernizing the post office structure and equipment, the efficiency of its services would actually be improved."

"Nevertheless," he said, "absolutely no affirmative action has yet been taken on any of a number of pending bills based on the Hoover report and endorsed by President Truman and Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson. The measures have been before Congress since July.

Mr. Chairman, certainly those of us who were in the Eightieth Congress recall quite vividly the circumstances surrounding the action of this subcommittee in connection with appropriations for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and for the Post Office Department. As the gentleman has so properly stated, both of those actions were finally revealed in their true colors. In view of what the gentleman has said with reference to the testimony of the Postmaster General and his assistant and with reference to the long-time understanding between the Department and the subcommittee that the door was always open for consultations about matters of administration, it is difficult not to associate this order with the same sort of attitude and purpose.

It is not difficult to foresee that the existing confusion will not and cannot be cleared up unless some responsible committee in Congress takes immediate action to develop the full facts, including the reasons for this failure to consult with this appropriation subcommittee and to determine the reasons for lack of action in connection with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, did Mr. Myers of the Post Office Department say anything about the cuts in the Department by the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. HESELTON. I have not been able to find any reference to that.

Mr. CANFIELD. He did not, of course. But in all fairness, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts there has been a suggestion made in our subcommittee report, a suggestion with which I do not agree, that certain economies can be effected through the curtailment of deliveries.

Mr. HESELTON. But not necessarily curtailing to the extent to which this order went.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to emphasize that the Postmaster General was invited by the very fair and able chairman of our subcommittee and the members thereof to come down and discuss his difficulties before issuing the order. He did not avail himself of a long-time invitation to come before us. Heretofore our relationships have been most happy and we are very much surprised at this order.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Is it then fair to say in summing this up that there is no reasonable relationship between this appropriation and the curtailment of services recently ordered by the Postmaster General? It is not because of this bill which is now pending, is it?

Mr. CANFIELD. I see no relationship except, may I say in frankness, the statement in the report indicating that some curtailment of deliveries would develop needed economies.

Mr. HAND. But the gentleman has said repeatedly that he did not come back to the committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is correct. There has been no coming back to our committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I understand from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that he is vigorously opposed to this curtailment which is being contemplated in the Post Office Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am.

Mr. JONAS. I commend and congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey. I hope he is as conscious as we are in Chicago of the fact that if these regulations were put into practical effect they would be the ruination from a commercial standpoint of some of the outlying districts in the big cities. The regulation carries with it possible repercussions and potentialities that are presently beyond description. I hope the gentleman will keep up the vigorous fight against this kind of legislation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. In view of the fine statement of the gentleman from New Jersey in which he has read from the testimony presented to his committee by the Postmaster General and his deputy, it seems to me we ought to undertake immediately an investigation of this matter with a view to having this order rescinded.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am in accord with that statement.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I am going to insert in the Appendix of the Record today an editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch which definitely proves that if the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are carried out there will be no deficit in the Post Office Department and the services will not be impaired.

Mr. CANFIELD. I could not agree entirely with that editorial. Undoubtedly some savings can be effected but not enough to cover the deficit of \$554,000,000.

Mr. BREHM. I wish the gentleman would read the editorial before definitely closing his mind on the subject.

Mr. CANFIELD. I will read it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat the statement I made last year and that is that the most pleasant

assignment I have had since becoming a Member of Congress is membership on the Post Office and Treasury Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee under the very able leadership of my Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. The distinguished Chairman has been fair, impartial and courteous to everyone, has permitted thorough consideration of the bill before you, and has handled the hearings with dispatch and order but certainly not in haste. The hearings on the bill lasted for several weeks and every phase was thoroughly considered. In my opinion this is one of the best bills ever reported out by the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, it is too early to make an accurate prediction as to what the reaction will be regarding Postmaster General Donaldson's order to curtail expenditures in the Post Office Department in favor of economy. Speaking for myself, I think it is a move in the right direction and I certainly hope that the move will prove to be contagious and other Departments will follow suit. I congratulate Mr. Donaldson on his effort to effect greater economy in the Post Office Department. The bill before the Committee calls for \$2,207,500,000 to operate the Post Office Department for fiscal 1951. It was established in the hearings that the total estimated revenue for the Post Office Department for fiscal 1951 would be \$1,681,000,000. This would leave an operating deficit of \$526,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused. I have received thousands of letters from my constituents insisting that we curtail expenditures; that we insist the Departments cut back. In my opinion, this is a move in the right direction. We have one Department head who is attempting to cut back to save the taxpayers money, and the same constituents who insisted I do something about curtailing expenditures, are now complaining about the Postmaster General's order to effect greater economy in the Post Office Department.

It must not be a very pleasant assignment for Postmaster General Donaldson and his staff to be forced to operate the Post Office Department with an annual deficit amounting to as much as it cost to operate the entire Federal Government annually as late as 1906. The postal service has been so expanded, a greater part of which is in subsidies, until it will cost several hundred million dollars more to operate the Post Office Department in 1951 than it cost to operate the entire Federal Government as late as 1917.

There are many towns and cities in my district receiving two, three, and in some instances four, mail deliveries daily. I believe that the people throughout the Nation in residential sections will be satisfied with one mail delivery a day, especially when they realize that the reduced service is to effect greater economy. If the majority of the people insist on reinstatement of this super-duper service, then they should be willing for the Congress to increase postal rates so that the Post Office Department may operate on a self-sustaining basis. When discussing the one mail delivery daily for residential sections, should we not

take into account that the average American works, and I should think in the majority of instances when he leaves his home in the morning he does not return until evening, at which time he picks up his mail from the mail box. Certainly it matters not to that individual whether the mail was delivered in the morning or afternoon. I repeat, in my candid opinion, our citizens will not complain when their mail delivery service has been reduced to one delivery daily.

It is just as well that the records show I advocated a postal-rate increase as far back as 1947, and the record will show that I voted for the postal-rate increase bill passed by the House early in February.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much is the Postmaster going to save with this reduction in service?

Mr. PASSMAN. In my opinion, when the directive is in full force, it will effect a saving of approximately \$82,000,000 annually. In the first year I think it will effect a saving of \$57,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. How much has the Postmaster General said it would be?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not privileged to divulge the source of my information, but I think it is accurate. In the first year the savings will be approximately \$57,000,000. May I say to the gentleman there will be no permanent postal employees discharged? Those discharged will be wartime appointees and substitute carriers. I might also state that the Post Office Department separates approximately 34,000 employees annually.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that the various subsidies should be charged to the Post Office deficit?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not, but the House passed a bill which increased the deficit by approximately half a million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. But the deficit of \$550,000,000 includes those subsidies?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is absolutely correct. This bill appropriates \$2,207,500,000. The estimated revenue will be \$1,681,000,000, and a deficit of \$554,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. How much of a curtailment of service, percentage-wise, has the Postmaster General ordered?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman can figure that out. However, if the Congress does not approve of his efforts I do not think it will encourage any of the other Departments to follow suit.

Mr. GROSS. I question whether there is any economy in this move.

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, the gentleman has a right to his opinion. During an election year many Members will be against it. I am not.

The only disappointing thing about the bill we passed is that, in my opinion, it failed to increase rates as much as they should have been increased. Had the bill called for an increase of three times

the amount, I still would have voted for it. The people whom I have the honor to represent in the Congress are beginning to realize that you cannot have your cake and eat it too, and that nothing comes free. The majority of them are in accord with my views that a postal rate increase is in line.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about increasing the personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. On April 3, 1950, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a break-down showing the number of employees in the Bureau of Internal Revenue from June 30, 1940, through June 30, 1950; also the amount appropriated for the Department during the same 10-year period. On June 30, 1940, there were 23,082 employees in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Congress appropriated for the Bureau in that year \$59,877,500. By comparison, it is estimated on June 30, 1950, there will be 56,495 employees in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Congress appropriated for that year \$226,300,000. If you will study the table that I inserted in the RECORD on April 3 you may find the information helpful in the event you are of the opinion the number of personnel for the Bureau should be increased.

Mr. Chairman, if we continue increasing the personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, could it be that eventually we will all make our living by collecting taxes from each other? There are 19,409 revenue agents and collectors in the field and this number does not include those in the Alcohol Tax Division. The following statement shows the estimated position strength of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at the close of the fiscal year 1950:

	Position strength fiscal year 1950
Field collectors:	
Revenue agents (listed as deputy collectors)	10,178
Revenue agents (listed as revenue agents)	7,843
Revenue agents (listed as intelligence agents)	1,302
Revenue agents (listed as miscellaneous tax agents)	86
Total	19,409
Audit Department:	
Office auditor	3,016
Returns examiner	1,023
Total	4,039
Alcohol Division:	
Alcohol tax investigators	628
Alcohol tax investigators	912
Alcohol tax storekeeper-gagers	1,488
Total	3,028
Total	26,476
Technical, legal, and administrative	6,678
Clerks	11,532
Clerk-stenographer	1,840
Clerk-typist	3,860
Stenographer	1,483
Typist	252
Operator of office devices	3,865
Messenger	233
Laborer	60
Guard	16
Total	23,141
Grand total	56,295

The committee is recommending funds for an additional 1,000 employees for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I am not too sure that the additional 1,000 employees are necessary and can be employed profitably. Should we not take into account that as a result of the 1948 Revenue Act there were an estimated 7,378,000 taxpayers dropped from the rolls? If you will refer to page 182 of the Treasury and Post Office hearings you will find testimony to the effect that the Bureau of Internal Revenue checked 14,000,000 files out of the estimated 54,000,000 individual returns filed, and that there was a tax change of only \$2 or more either for or against the Government. The testimony reveals, on the basis of the preliminary checks, about 90 percent were against the Government and 10 percent of the 14,000,000 returns checked were against the taxpayer. This certainly was a very unprofitable procedure. At least it indicates that the Bureau of Internal Revenue had sufficient personnel because it required many thousands of man-hours to check 14,000,000 returns. In fact this was the first time the Department had conducted an audit control program of this nature.

Certainly it is the intent of the committee, and I am sure of the Congress, to furnish the Bureau of Internal Revenue with sufficient personnel to do the kind of job expected of them, but there should be a limit on the expansion of all departments, and I am wondering if we have not already passed that limit in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. ALBERT. If the American people cannot get along with one mail delivery service daily in the residential districts, just what will they stand for in the name of economy?

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Those who reside in rural sections get but one mail delivery a day. I should remind the gentleman that business houses will still receive two deliveries daily.

Mr. GROSS. Under the Postmaster General's order if they get two a day they are cut to one.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think if the gentleman will check the directive, he will find that it applies to residential sections, not business sections.

Mr. GROSS. It applies to business sections also. If they get two deliveries they are cut to one; if they get three they are cut to two.

Mr. PASSMAN. I repeat, I think the directive curtails delivery only in residential areas. Business sections will continue to receive two deliveries daily.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman states that by curtailing service and taking people off pay rolls we will save money.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to answer the gentleman by saying that if it is going to make for prosperity to put people on the pay rolls, let us start adding additional personnel right across the board.

Mr. SADLAK. If we follow that theory, it means the less service we render, the fewer people we have on the pay roll, then the more money we save.

Carrying that argument to its ultimate conclusion, if we rendered no service and had no people on the pay roll we would save still more money.

Mr. PASSMAN. The directive is not going that far. With this country facing a \$14,000,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year 1950-51 it is time we started to save wherever we can.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. There is a vast difference, is there not, between eliminating essential service and eliminating nonessential service?

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the chairman for his contribution to my statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it would not be a complete presentation by a subcommittee unless all of us were to take the floor and tell you how much we love each other. That I can do quite successfully, because I enjoyed very much working with my fellow members on the subcommittee. I enjoy very much less, however, working under this one-package bill. I think it is a snare and a delusion and that it will prove so before we get through. I trust that in another year and in another Congress we will have learned our lesson and not try to do this again. In my humble opinion, the one-package bill is the bill to end appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor only to express myself on two points that have been raised in the debate today that seem to be somewhat controversial, points in regard to Post Office and Coast Guard matters.

As far as I can see, the steps taken by the Postmaster General are in the right direction. Whether they go too far I am not prepared to judge, because I am not the Administrator. I believe some economy can be made undoubtedly to a greater or less extent without any real inconvenience to anyone. But I do very seriously object to the timing of the Postmaster General in making this apparently drastic reduction in service. It certainly looks to me to be open to the suspicion of political motives. After all, there has been a great Post Office deficit for a number of years, but why did we not have this reduction of mail service 6 months ago or 3 months ago? I will tell you why we did not; it just happens to be appropriation time, and all these department heads would like a little more money, no matter what they do to get it.

One further point. Mr. Chairman, I understand that my distinguished and lovable colleague from New Jersey is going to offer an amendment to establish the Coast Guard Reserve training. He is going to offer a sugar-coated amendment calling for a million paltry dollars. Let us not delude ourselves; let us be frank. It is not one million it is going to cost; that is but the entering wedge, the camel's nose under the tent. You should consider \$8,000,000 as the cost of the total program according to the admiral's estimate; and then add at least \$2,000,000 more to arrive at what it will

actually cost. You are therefore dealing with the inauguration of a new \$10,000,000 program.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, this is not time to begin new programs. There has never been a program in this field; it is not necessary. There are 850,000 men in training in all the reserves, the Army, Navy, and the Air Corps; and as far as wartime conditions and wartime emergency in our ports is concerned, no few thousand reservists are going to make any visible difference.

Mr. CANFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure that when I present my amendment to the House I can convince the gentleman that it is necessary at this time.

Mr. COUDERT. There are a great many things which the subcommittee chairman has referred to that I would like to see done. The fact remains, however, that we are subject to certain limitations, economic limitations of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on chapter IV has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Treasurer, including printing and binding, \$5,200,000: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred or advanced to this appropriation, from Railroad Retirement Board, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture," and from available corporate funds of Government owned or controlled corporations, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expenses incurred in the clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

TAX-FREE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to interrogate the chairman and ranking minority member on the item of appropriations for the internal revenue. You will recall that some time ago I introduced a bill to set up a separate Office of Transportation. Also I have several times discussed here the matter of tax-free transportation. It has now come to my attention that our transportation tax has been evaded to such an extent that it was necessary last September for the Department to issue a ruling against the abuse of tax evasion by air and by ship. I have been reliably informed that certain transportation people encouraged and are alleged to have been in collusion with travelers to secure tax-free air-travel and ship-travel tickets outside the borders of the United States and thus evaded our 15-percent transportation tax. I am reliably informed that this unlawful evasion of transportation tax was so prolific that offices were set up in many foreign places near our borders; that American tourist and travel agencies lost tremendous revenues. The practice, I am told, is to purchase travel tickets in these foreign locations and American and foreign travelers thus were able to secure tax-free tickets and evade the transportation tax. In this way the taxpayers were not only deprived of the 15-percent transportation tax but the

Treasury Department was deprived of the income tax which would have been made by the American agencies who lost this business to the foreign offices. I have asked the chairman of our subcommittee to study my suggestion regarding an investigation into this matter to determine whether or not it is possible to make some retroactive recovery to these evaded taxes. Back-dated or back-routed air and ship tickets and stubs are available and if it is possible to make some recovery for this alleged evasion I propose to press the request for a full investigation. Just how far this alleged collusion and encouragement to secure and evade transportation tax has been participated in by transportation people can easily be ascertained from such a proposed investigation. However, I now wish some statement from the membership of this committee on this subject. How much revenue have we lost as a result of this alleged tax evasion?

Mr. GARY. I cannot give the gentleman exact figures, but I can say that matter has been discussed by our committee with the proper officials of the department and we have been assured by representatives of the department that they are going to make a special drive to break up that practice.

Mr. STEFAN. It was and is a very bad practice. I do not know whether it is the fault of the commercial airlines who are alleged to have encouraged and show these people how to get this tax-free transportation or not. I do not know whether it is their fault or whether or not there has been some negligence on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board or other agencies. Only last September an order went out to these people indicating that the practice was in operation. Why can we not go into the records and find out how much money we lost during the time that they neglected to collect the 15 percent tax so that we might recover that back into the Treasury? I am asking the chairman of my subcommittee to make some investigation where the fault lies and whether or not some retroactive action should be taken.

Mr. GARY. I think the gentleman is very wise in requesting an investigation by his committee. I think an investigation of that kind would more properly be the subject of his committee than ours. We have discussed the matter in our committee, and I will say that our committee will be delighted to cooperate with any other committees in the investigation of this particular subject.

Mr. STEFAN. I am informed that after the order of September last was issued that an estimate had been made, which indicated the Treasury lost many millions of dollars.

Mr. GARY. Certainly, any loophole of that kind should be closed, and if there has been a violation of the law, I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that some retroactive action should be taken.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In regard to the purchase of tickets in cities outside of

the territorial limits of the United States, do I understand that tickets purchased for a flight wholly within the United States can be secured and avoid taxes in that way?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Like the purchase of a ticket in Cuba for a flight from Washington to San Francisco, for example.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. They sent for tax-free tickets to these foreign places set up for this purpose. I do not know whether they are doing it now since the September order was issued.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Could that not be corrected by having the companies show on the ticket whether a tax was paid.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, that could be the work of the investigators if we set up the investigation. That fact can be easily found on stubs and duplicates.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that I commend him for his righteous interest in this matter of evasion of transportation taxes due to the United States Government as the result of the alleged encouragement by the commercial air lines in the purchase of tickets in foreign countries to avoid the payment of such taxes. I assure my friend from Nebraska that I shall cooperate with him to the fullest extent in ascertaining the true situation in regard thereto.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for collecting the revenue from customs, enforcement of navigation laws under section 102, Reorganization Plan No. III of 1946, and of other laws enforced by the Bureau of Customs, and the detection and prevention of frauds, including not to exceed \$100,000 for the securing of information and evidence; transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; expenses of attendance, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; not to exceed \$12,000 for maintenance and improvement of buildings and sites, acquired under the act of June 26, 1930 (19 U. S. C. 68); printing and binding; purchase of 100 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; arms and ammunition; not to exceed \$1,070,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under law (19 U. S. C. 1525); \$36,500,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order against the portion of this section starting in the middle of line 7, page 101, reading as follows: "expenses of attendance, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation."

I make the point of order on the ground that this involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary and

is subject to the same point of order which was made against a similar provision in the appropriation bill relating to the Commerce Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the previous ruling on this bill, I think the point of order is well taken. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the language quoted by him appearing in lines 7 to 10 on page 101. The gentleman from Virginia concedes the point of order; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: Insert on page 101, line 7, after the semicolon, the following language: "expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 33, noes 38.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. CANFIELD.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this portion of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. Representing as I do a substantial part of the great port of New York I make inquiry with regard to the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Customs, wherein there is a reduction of \$473,300 from the amount of the budget estimate. Is any part of this reduction of \$473,300 specifically directed by the committee to the personnel of the Customs Service in the port of New York?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the answer is absolutely no. In fact, no part of this reduction is specifically directed to the port of New York, or the port of Boston or any other particular port. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that although the reduction here is \$473,300 on an item of \$36,500,000 the committee allowed the Bureau of Customs \$1,350,000 more than the appropriation for 1950.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, my friend from Virginia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the House, on a teller vote, has just refused to cut down the item for travel, I want to call attention to the fact that

in this abstract of "objects of expenditure" submitted by the budget, the amount allowed for travel in 1949 and 1950 was seven-tenths of 1 percent, over all; and in 1951 it is nine-tenths of 1 percent. It is gradually creeping up. Now, if you are going to vote for all of these increases as they come along, those things are going to be bad.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST GUARD OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, including personal services at the seat of government; pay and allowances, as authorized by law, for commissioned officers, cadets, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel, on active duty; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); printing and binding; purchase of not to exceed 66 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; not to exceed \$190,000 for recreation, amusement, comfort, and contentment of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard, to be expended pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary; and examinations of estimates of appropriations in the field; \$135,000,000: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed 110 exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any enlisted man of the Coast Guard while detailed for duty at Coast Guard headquarters if such detail increases above 30 the total number of enlisted men so detailed to duty at such time: *Provided further*, That (a) the unobligated balances of appropriations to the Coast Guard for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 for "Salaries, Office of the Commandant," "Pay and allowances," "General expenses," and "Civilian employees" shall be transferred on July 1, 1950, to the account established by the Surplus Fund-Certified Claims Act of 1949 for payment of certified claims; (b) amounts equal to the unliquidated obligations against such prior year appropriations on July 1, 1950, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation, but on July 1, 1951, there shall be transferred from such merged appropriation to the appropriation for payment of certified claims (1) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1949 appropriations so transferred, and (2) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1950 appropriations so transferred which is in excess of the obligations then remaining unliquidated against such appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD:
On page 109, line 1, strike out the amount "\$135,000,000" and insert "\$136,000,000."

And on page 109, line 4, insert the following after the colon: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for expenses of Reserve training, including pay and allowances of Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty engaged primarily in administration of the Reserve training program, and including drill pay at rates not to exceed those prescribed by or pursuant to law for the Naval Reserve."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would not be proposing this increase did I not believe it was absolutely necessary for the proper defense of our Nation and as I project the amendment I am mindful of the expression used by Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, when he first addressed the House on the omnibus one-package appropriation bill. He said:

This is a war budget.

The Library of Congress recently issued a report on a national-defense study which states, among other things, that the Communists of our country had well-laid plans to sabotage ports and other installations. Last Wednesday, speaking in New York, W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador at Large, charged that the Kremlin plans to rule the world involved disruption and paralysis and the same night, speaking in the same city, J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, said:

The Communists, with Moscow as their guiding genius, are determined through every available means—sabotage, espionage, civil war, and dissension—to destroy democracy throughout the world.

The President and the Bureau of the Budget this year requested \$4,100,000 to activate the Reserve. Our committee rejected the request. However, the Coast Guard has now agreed with me that the program can be started properly on the \$1,000,000 I now seek. I have the permission of the distinguished chairman of my subcommittee, Mr. GARY of Virginia, to say that he is in agreement with me that these funds should be provided.

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, who has been active in enforcing a policy of economy in the armed forces, is most anxious that moneys be provided for the Coast Guard Reserve. Let me quote Secretary Johnson:

I desire to go on record as fully concurring in the requests for the necessary funds for this purpose.

Reminding Congress and the country of the invaluable services rendered by the Coast Guard in the late war, he continues:

I am particularly perturbed about the security of our ports in the event of an emergency.

It is vital to national defense that a modest but highly trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent waterfront fires and explosions, control the identity of waterfront personnel, and so forth.

I wish to emphasize that in my opinion the maximum need for this function will be immediately upon the declaration of an emergency.

The Coast Guard is not only entitled to have an organized reserve sufficient for immediate mobilization in an emergency, but national interest most urgently requires it.

Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, has endorsed Defense

Secretary Johnson's urgent appeal for an active Coast Guard Reserve and I have recently received letters from the national headquarters of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States pointing out that their national conventions last year called for this action at once.

It was atom scientist Harold C. Urey who told the Senate last February that if the Russians wanted to "send atom bombs or H-bombs into New York Harbor on merchant ships and explode them there, they could do it without much trouble."

I hold in my hand a United Press dispatch appearing in this morning's issue of the New York Times under a Washington date line and captioned "Urey bids United States guard against atom mining." The article quotes Dr. Urey as saying that "our country should do much more to guard against the danger of submarines mining American harbors with atomic bombs." Dr. Urey was further quoted as saying that he understood that there had been some activity along this line. I can say that part of the activity he has in mind is embraced in the very amendment we are now considering.

George Fielding Eliot, military expert, made a 2-week survey of port security in New York Harbor early this year, and he reported that only one conclusion was possible—we are wide open to a sneak atom bomb attack and so are other United States seaports. He elaborated on the unhappy fact that the reservoir of trained personnel for port-security duties—the United States Coast Guard Reserve, with a wartime strength of 144,000 officers and men—exists today only on paper. He contended that this deficiency must be corrected promptly, for "it is the very foundation of security for our great seaports which today are sitting ducks for an A-bomb."

It did not take the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies long to round up and intern suspected Germans and Japanese in our country when World War II broke out. It took very little time for our country to learn they apparently had no real plans for sabotage. However, it is agreed by our defense planners and all our protective agencies that should war come with Russia the situation will be entirely different. The Communist agent is the Trojan horse, the fifth columnist, dedicated to espionage and sabotage. He has been trained in the art of destruction. Privately our military leadership feels that potential sabotage is a greater danger to our country than is the threat of an atom- or H-bomb being dropped on our cities.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROBINO] recently inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper report on port sabotage by Communists in Italy. The article stated the riots and sabotage which have gripped the ports of France and now spreading to Italy are being lavishly financed, carefully prepared actions, directed on a military basis by foreign military agents. It concluded that the spring offensive against Italy's docks would need outside help.

It will be recalled that in 1942 it was a young Coast Guardsman, John C. Cul-

len, seaman, second class, who discovered the Nazi saboteurs on a Long Island beach and sounded the alarm that led to their eventual capture.

I have in my possession editorials from our country's leading newspapers, letters from governors and mayors of coastal States and seaboard cities pleading for favorable approval of the action I now sponsor, but more important than anything else, perhaps, is an exceedingly strong letter to me from Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, dated April 17, 1950, stressing the need of these funds and pointing out that if they are not allowed and M-day comes, it will be at least 60 days before the Selective Service System can give the Coast Guard any men whatever for port security purposes. Let me read:

In keeping with request made in your letter of April 7, 1950, I am pleased to furnish you with my views concerning the need for having an activated Coast Guard Reserve available in the event of a national emergency.

It is my understanding that the wartime missions assigned to the Coast Guard are an extension of their peacetime activities on a wartime basis, with an added port security duty, and that no other military service will perform these duties nor do they have any plans for performing them.

The defense of this country has always rested on the principle that we should constantly maintain a small regular force as a first line of defense. The Regulars, augmented by the Reserves, must present a sufficient force, adequately trained, to hold the line on the land, air, and sea for the time necessary to permit the mobilization of the citizens of the country through the selective-service process.

In keeping with this policy there is maintained by the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, a trained Reserve. The Coast Guard, however, at the present time cannot, due to limitation of funds, maintain the trained Reserve so necessary to the accomplishment of their wartime mission. This, therefore, may represent the weak link in our chain of preparedness.

It will require a minimum of 60 days before the Selective Service System, even though it is in being and operating on M-day, can reach a sustainable induction rate of 300,000 men. Present plans by the regular armed forces call for numbers greatly in excess of those than can be delivered by the Selective Service System in the days immediately following an emergency.

It can be readily seen, therefore, that the Coast Guard cannot expect immediate augmentation through the delivery of men by the Selective Service System, and, even were this possible, the fact should not be overlooked that there would be months before these men could be adequately trained to perform the specialized duties assigned to the Coast Guard during wartime.

In light of these circumstances, I strongly endorse the amendment which you and Congressman VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia, are sponsoring to appropriate funds for the training of the Coast Guard Reserve.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

We did not have General Hershey's letter before us when we considered this item in the subcommittee and if there is any doubt in anybody's mind now, this letter should dispel it. General Hershey's testimony, summed up, means just this: Should an emergency come it will be more than 2 months before the Selective Serv-

ice can give the Coast Guard one man. In other words we could only get them from a trained reserve provided by the funds sought in this amendment. It is in the best interests in the United States to pass it without delay.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. Every Member of this body knows that in the recent global conflict all the branches of our armed services rendered a magnificent performance.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman and I hope no Member of the House will offer an amendment to my amendment to appropriate larger funds, because this is the amount agreed upon by the Coast Guard. As a matter of fact, the amendment was written in a Coast Guard office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it may be that I have a wildcat by the tail in trying to oppose this amendment, but we shall see.

Mr. Chairman, in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] I do not propose to say that the amendment is without merit. However, I should like to say to the committee that, in my opinion, this is not the appropriate time to initiate any new program or incur new expenses. Certainly that applies to programs which can be deferred without affecting our national defense.

The Committee on Appropriations, in the bill before you, has done everything possible to refrain from inaugurating new projects or functions and it seems to me that this is one of those programs which could be further deferred, especially in view of the present condition of the United States Treasury.

The Coast Guard has never operated an active reserve program in peacetime as have the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. As you know, during peacetime the Coast Guard performs peacetime functions in much the same manner as do other Government agencies, business concerns, and individuals. During time of peace the Coast Guard is separated from other military establishments and placed under the Secretary of the Treasury. Only during war is it taken over for war functions in a manner not too different from that in which industrial plants are utilized. In wartime the Government takes over many activities which, for the duration of the war, must operate by Government directives.

Upon the declaration of war or when the President directs, the Coast Guard

shall operate as a service in the Navy and shall so continue until the President, by Executive order, transfers the Coast Guard back to the Treasury Department. While operating as a service in the Navy, the Coast Guard shall be subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy who may order changes in Coast Guard operations to render them uniform to wartime conditions, to the extent he deems advisable, with Navy operations.

Mention has been made of a letter from the Secretary of Defense supporting a Coast Guard Reserve. To my way of thinking Mr. Johnson's letter is not too significant. In fact, such a letter is to be expected, inasmuch as most bureaus and department heads work together, and in entirely too many instances, on a prearranged and reciprocal basis.

It is very noticeable that in many instances where a request is made for Federal funds for a new program, the proponent attempts to tie the program in with national defense. Of course it is a good argument and in many instances such a claim receives sympathetic consideration.

The amendment before you requests only a million dollars to start the Coast Guard Reserve. You know, as well as I do, that the purpose of the amendment and the small amount requested is only to get a foot in the door. In all probability, if this amendment is adopted, before the appropriation bill is passed by both bodies, the amount will be increased by many millions of dollars. It is to be expected that this is only a beginning of an expensive program because history will reveal that once a new program is started, it will expand. That is true of almost all departments, bureaus and programs.

Something has been said about the Coast Guard protecting our coasts and cities in time of war. With due deference to the Coast Guard and its splendid activity, I must say, in my candid opinion, if we ever permit the enemy to get that close to our shores, it will be too late for the Coast Guard to take over and protect our country.

I should like to repeat that the Coast Guard is not an arm of the National Defense Establishment in time of peace, but only in time of war is the Coast Guard considered a part of our defense establishment as such. Not until war is declared or when the President directs, is the Coast Guard taken over from the Treasury for war functions in a manner not too different from that in which industrial plants are utilized, and for that matter, almost every other operation, including people, that can help win a war.

As you know, the Regular Coast Guard is rendering a valuable service under the very able leadership of Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neill, Commandant of the Coast Guard. My opposition to the amendment must not be construed as a reflection on the Regular Coast Guard. I am making my plea in favor of economy and I am convinced that the defeat of this amendment will have no material effect upon the functions of the Regular Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee will vote down the pending amendment in

favor of economy, in my opinion, it will be a step in the right direction. At some future date, when our finances are in better shape, we can give consideration to this new program along with many other programs that have been rejected during this session of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the fact that the President has recommended that no new projects be begun; that we finish those already under way, does not the gentleman think this is a rather inopportune time to be starting an entirely new project which will result in large expenditures; that we should use the scant funds available for projects already under way and postpone new expenditures until the budget is nearer in balance?

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contributions and I am in complete accord with his views. It is my understanding, according to an agreement at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, that we would carry on our labors on appropriations according to a definite schedule, and that has been done up to this point, but if we start increasing the appropriations bill before you, there will be no stopping place.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I just want to quote the first paragraph of Public Law 207 of the Eighty-first Congress:

The Coast Guard as established January 28, 1915, shall be a military service and a branch of the armed forces of the United States at all times. The Coast Guard shall be a service in the Treasury Department except when operating as a service of the Navy.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, but the Defense Establishment does not provide for running the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I come to the well of the House. I have had a rather difficult task today defending Postmaster General Donaldson in his efforts to effect economies in the Post Office Department, and I desire to follow through in favor of economy by opposing this amendment. No doubt it is very good, and there are many new projects we are desirous of inaugurating, but the condition of our economy demands that a halt be called.

I mentioned in my remarks earlier today that the combined deficit for the years 1950 and 1951 will be approximately \$14,000,000,000. Now remember that our national revenue is at its highest, and if we continue building up this deficit in times of prosperity, what are we going to do when we return to what we consider a normal condition, and revenues drop? Of course, these projects will have been started, and it will be very difficult to abolish them. I hope you will oppose this amendment in favor of economy, and if we see our way clear next year, we can then give further thought to debating this type of program.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I feel however, that when wars are won they have to be won by the men of the National Guard and the men of what we call the Reserve group, and the volunteers, and I feel that it is not good economy not to encourage and inspire men who are in the Reserve Corps, who must become the nucleus of a large army in case of an emergency.

Mr. PASSMAN. We were able to get along in World Wars I and II without a Coast Guard reserve, and so far as numbers are concerned, percentagewise, it would be a very small part of the total military personnel, if the Coast Guard is to be construed as part of the military establishment in time of war.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I do not want to transgress further, but does the gentleman not feel that the type of warfare has changed, and the obligation developing on the Coast Guard is entirely different?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think I could justify certain large new projects this year if we had the money and I could get enough Members to listen to me, but I think we have gone too far and we should start cutting back and hold the line as per our agreement at the beginning of the session.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: Strike "\$136,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$139,100,000", and strike the figure "\$1,000,000" and insert the figure "\$4,100,000."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am at a loss to understand frankly the amendment offered by the gentleman in view of the fact that he voted to defeat the original request, holding any funds were unnecessary. He was totally opposed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, my position is still the same.

Mr. CANFIELD. That was in the subcommittee.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. I will be very glad to explain to the gentleman, and he will see that my position has not changed.

My amendment simply raises the amount to the amount which the Coast Guard requested from the committee. My idea is that if we are going to embark on this program it ought to be done properly and adequately. My amendment has been submitted so that we may face the issue squarely and not fool ourselves by appropriating just \$1,000,000 at a time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Will this put back the \$4,100,000 into the bill?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This will put back the \$4,100,000 in the bill. I am going to say very frankly, however, if my amendment carries I will still vote against the amendment as amended.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for the Members to have a little of the history of the Coast Guard Reserve. In 1939 there was no Coast Guard Reserve but one was organized which was called the Coast Guard Reserve, a volunteer organization of patriotic men connected with the Coast Guard who wanted to drill and keep in training, and be prepared to serve in the Coast Guard. In 1941 the Congress, taking cognizance of that spirit, passed a bill authorizing the organization of a Coast Guard Reserve. Thereupon the volunteer Coast Guard Reserve changed its name and called itself the Coast Guard Auxiliary. During the war, of course, there was no need for a Coast Guard Reserve. Everybody was in active service. After the war and until last year there were no requests for appropriations for the Coast Guard Reserves. However, the Coast Guard Auxiliary continued to act. It is well organized and is doing a very excellent job, a patriotic job. I do not blame my distinguished chairman and the ranking member the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] for being sympathetic toward the work that these men are doing.

What does this provide? This provides for the same work that the volunteer Coast Guard Auxiliary is doing. I will read from the record just what they will be doing.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] asked this question in the committee:

Mr. GARY. When these men join the reserve, they meet so many nights a month for training and drill, and you will pay them for the time that they actually put into the reserve at the same rate the Army and Navy pays? Is that right?

Admiral O'NEILL. Yes; the same as in the Navy.

It may be, as it was in 1941 when the authorization bill was passed and the clouds of war were gathering, that today as the clouds of war seem to be gathering this may be a very necessary thing. Certainly I am sympathetic toward it. But if we are going to have this organization and if it is necessary for the defense of the country, and if our defenses are going to depend upon this, then let us do it right. Let us not do it piecemeal. Let us face the issue squarely and either give them what they need, the \$4,100,000 which they say will provide for the training of 1,900 officers and 6,000 enlisted men, for this year, the ultimate goal being to train 2,469 officers and 26,645 men, the appropriations hereafter being estimated at \$8,000,000 per year—as I was saying, let us either do the job right or let us put it off to another year and study the matter further. The condition of our economy is such that we should be very, very careful before embarking upon a new program. But if the conditions and the times require it then let us do the job right. I hope my amendment will be adopted. Then we shall face the issue squarely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Let us postpone the matter for another year and give it real, careful study. If our economic conditions then permit it, then let us give them a real job. But my recommendation at this time is that we face the issue squarely. In view of our tremendous deficit we feel it wise to postpone this program a while longer. We have been without it for 3 or 4 years now, since the war closed, and we do not believe great harm or great hardship would be imposed by carrying on as at present. This Coast Guard Auxiliary is doing an excellent job, and I take my hat off to them. They are doing a fine, patriotic job, and I do not like to ask them to continue to do it without pay. But our economic conditions are such that I think we ought not embark on it at this time. However, if we must do it, let us do it right. The Congress in 1941 authorized it and sooner or later the wishes of the Congress should be respected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has again expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the flowing rhetoric of that carefully prepared statement which my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] presented to the House. As I listened to him it seemed to me that he had found the formula for national security and peace, all at the expense of a few paltry dollars, to wit, \$1,000,000.

The point seems to be that my friend from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] would open the door just ever so little, just a little tiny crack to let in the light; and then along would come the lightning and the thunder storm, and instead of one million it would be a \$12,000,000 program for the reserve.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Instead of in this manner let us have the actual statistics and figures.

Mr. COUDERT. I will be glad to have the actual statistics.

Mr. GARY. The Coast Guard last year requested three and one-half million to start this project, the Reserves. This year they ask for \$4,100,000. The chairman asked them, and they said very frankly that that was not enough to support the program when it was in full swing. So the chairman asked them the question specifically as to how much they expected it ultimately would cost, and they said six million, and not twelve or fifteen million.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I looked at the record a moment ago, and I wonder if the gentle-

man's recollection is accurate. The record says \$8,000,000.

Mr. GARY. I stand corrected. It is eight million. I was quoting from memory. I knew it was not twelve million.

Mr. COUDERT. I will tell you why I think it is twelve. I have yet to see a department program that is not presented initially at the minimum cost; the minimum, to be greatly increased. I think the chairman will have to agree to that.

The problem is a very simple one, Mr. Chairman. This program is not going to determine the success or failure of war—victory or defeat. A small Coast Guard Reserve is not going to secure the ports of the great coasts of the United States in the event of atomic warfare or in the event of a foreign foe reaching these shores. Just imagine a few thousand Coast Guardsmen providing security against sabotage, against atomic bombs, against attacks of any kind in the ports of New York, San Francisco, Boston, Baltimore, and all the rest of them. Only a great civilian-defense organization will be necessary.

Now, let us get down to real facts and statistics. The total of this Coast Guard Reserve, if the Coast Guard got what they wanted, would be a mere 26,000 officers and men. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have a bomb dropped on the city of New York, the New York port area, you will need a million trained civilians, a trained civilian service, and you are going to need it from Maine to California, in case war is brought to our shores, and not a mere 26,000 Reserves in the Coast Guard.

Where are you going to stop this reserve business? Are you going to set up a reserve training program for the FBI, for the Secret Service? Are you going to set up a reserve training program for all of the police departments and the State police throughout the United States? Is there not some point at which we have to be realistic?

We have 1,600,000 men in the armed services; we have 850,000 active reservists in the Army, Air Force, and Navy. Do we have to add another \$4,000,000 this year and another \$8,000,000 next year for an insignificant minor program that will cost money and contribute very, very little? Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on the Armed Services, who injected an observation earlier in the debate: If this proposal for a Coast Guard Reserve is so important to the national defense why does not your Committee provide that this function of the Coast Guard be taken over by the Defense Department? Why should not Secretary Johnson's budget bear the burden of this item if it is part of this unified, single whole? Let it be made part of it; do not let it be tossed around here like a vestigial appendix, a remains that belongs nowhere and has no place in the organized defense system. Why should we be called upon separately and apart from the armed services, the Defense Department, to have to reach a decision upon a technical matter of this sort? I think the military value of this one million is insignificant, because it adds nothing that is vital. It is only an entering wedge. If we are going to have it, let us follow the suggestion of the

courageous and realistic gentleman from New Mexico; let us accept his amendment; let us face the \$4,000,000 and then vote for it or against it. I shall vote against it because I do not think the additional cost can be justified. May I add: That although opposed to appropriating additional funds at this time, I yield to no one in my respect for the Coast Guard and the fine men who compose it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] to increase the amount of this particular item from \$1,000,000 to \$4,100,000, which is the amount that the Budget said was necessary, and which is the amount which Secretary of Defense Johnson says is necessary to do this job. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of idle talk in the Congress on this argument thus far, but I think it is fair to go back to the basic law, which is 14 United States Code 1226, section 1, which states specifically that the Coast Guard "shall be a military service and constitute a branch of the land and naval forces at all times." I think when we bear that in mind we realize the strength and importance of the functions of the Coast Guard in time of war. To my mind this is one organization, Mr. Chairman, which is peculiarly strong in that it has a useful function in time of peace and a vital function in time of war. It is vital in time of war to the defense of this country that we have a well-organized Coast Guard and a well-organized Coast Guard Reserve. I say out of the knowledge of my legislative experience on the Committee on the Armed Services that I think this is one of the weakest chains in our defense program. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson said in the concluding sentence of his letter asking for \$4,100,000 for the Coast Guard:

I wish to emphasize that in my opinion the most important need for this protection will be immediately upon a declaration of emergency—

Not declaration of war, but declaration of emergency.

With the Coast Guard Reserve especially we will have no time to organize or expand after the emergency comes. The vital problem there is going to be the problem of protecting the great ports of the Nation through which channel the supplies, men, and materials to our Allies and to our own troops overseas; and our organization which protects and guards those ports against sabotage must be in being and must be efficient at the time of the emergency.

You ask why the matter of ports is so vital. Through the ports of this Nation are going to move the supplies and explosives; and there it is that we find, even at the present time, much communism and sabotage. When the emergency comes, our Coast Guard Reserve will be called into active service immediately, it will be put on duty watching the movement of high explosives and vital war materials which will be channelled through these ports. It will try to stop the vast explosions which unfortunately occurred during the First World War in the great ports of the Nation and

will stop the disruption of the shipment of these materials and men overseas.

We have the blitz type of war to face at the present time. No more, Mr. Chairman, can we have a full year, as we had in the Second World War, to prepare our men and to prepare our factories to face a shooting war. The next time it is going to hit us with lightning-like suddenness and our Coast Guard will be in fact our first line of defense of the Nation. Therefore, we cannot afford to take a chance in the defense of the Nation by refusing to appropriate a small \$4,100,000 which the Secretary of Defense says is needed at the present time.

I am supporting with great earnestness and much seriousness this amendment to start the Coast Guard Reserve. Our reserve components constitute one of the least expensive parts of our defense program. We are not throwing away money, we are not wasting it unnecessarily, we are not starting a new program here with the Coast Guard Reserves; but we are carrying on a vital part of our training program which is to organize our reserve components and put them in a state of readiness for an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee and immediately preceding that reserving 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] the ranking minority member.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the last 5 minutes of the hour and 15 minutes be reserved for the committee and that the preceding 5 minutes be reserved for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the full committee if he will agree, since I have been allotted time, that my time will be considered committee time; in other words, that it will be 8 minutes instead of 5, and that I shall have part of that time?

Mr. CANNON. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, what is the request now, finally?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that of the time fixed, the last 5 minutes be allotted to the committee, and the last 5 minutes preceding that be allotted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I never have objected to any such request as this, but the committee has spoken for and against this amendment, and others of us have an interest, so therefore I object.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is just circumventing the objection made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. Now, I object to both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late to object to the first one. The gentleman can object to the request made by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have been on my feet all the time seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the present request?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How can I?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. I do not understand this standing up to get time in order to double one man's time so that another will have no time. Now, does that require unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked whether there was objection, and there was none. It is entirely within the control of the Committee.

Mr. BARDEN. This is the first time I have seen an epidemic of that. I have seen unusual cases, but I think we should take notice when it becomes an epidemic. That is not very good sportsmanship.

The CHAIRMAN. It has to be done by unanimous consent, and it is within the control of every Member of the Committee.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, after considerable confusion and noise here, I hope that we can remain silent for the next 4 or 5 minutes and to think seriously and soberly about the issue that is before us.

I am sure that every Member of this body realizes that every branch of our armed services turned in a marvelous

performance in the last global conflict, and there is enough glory to go around to each one of them. But, too much praise and glory cannot be paid the Coast Guard which serves our country in both times of peace and of war.

Recall our landings in north Africa, at Oran, where the Coast Guard rendered such valorous and valuable assistance in the landing on that continent. I would not have you forget the tremendous service that the Coast Guard rendered in patrolling our shores and accompanying the convoys on their long journeys to Murmansk, around the North Cape; in fact, the Coast Guard everywhere wrote for itself a glorious chapter in the history of our country during the last war. It now serves the country just as valiantly and heroically in time of peace in rescue work and in disaster on land, as well as on sea.

The United States Coast Guard is comprised of men who are unselfish and unafraid. Many of them serve in the Reserves without pay. They are pure patriots whose loyalty is unquestioned and whose devotion is unlimited. Much of their work is highly technical and these men cannot be trained in a day. The men who serve in the Coast Guard Reserve deserve fair and equal treatment with those who serve in the Reserves of our Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Forces.

The Coast Guard is the one branch of our Services and the only Government agency which was and is charged with the sole responsibility for the protection and security of our rivers, harbors, and ports. I do not know just why it is but in time of war the Coast Guard is always considered an integral part of our armed services and is under the direction and control of the Secretary of National Defense, but in time of peace it reverts to the control of the Department of the Treasury.

I think anyone who is acquainted with its work will have to admit there is a very close affinity between the Coast Guard and the Navy in time of peace as well as in time of war.

One fact has not been pointed out here this afternoon. That is the Coast Guard already has a reserve. It is not a new thing but it has no funds. This money we are voting is simply to give some training, if not adequate training, at least to give them some semblance of training in time of peace in order to keep them efficient and helpful. They will not have time to train after the outbreak of hostilities. The sum that we are asking for is paltry in comparison with the billions of dollars that we have voted for other purposes.

I cannot speak with authority perhaps for every member of our Committee on Armed Services, but I have talked to practically every one of them, including the chairman, and everyone with whom I have spoken is wholeheartedly in favor of this appropriation for training reserves in the Coast Guard which has rendered such valuable and inestimable service.

Certainly I do not want to create new agencies. I hesitate to see the camel get its nose under the tent and build up a giant, sprawling, spawning bureaucracy.

I do not want to see that. But I think the true criterion by which to judge the work and worth of any Government agency or the function of any branch of our Government is not whether it is new or old but whether it is necessary or unnecessary; whether it is essential or non-essential. I can think of no work more essential or indispensable than that performed by the Coast Guard today.

Of course the gentleman from New York unconsciously belittled and ridiculed the Coast Guard, saying that 26,000 men could not keep the enemy away. Anyone with a thimbleful of brains realizes that. We are not going to do away with our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and Air Force simply by building up our Coast Guard. We know that the methods of Soviet Russia are the methods of psychological penetration and infiltration. We know that the Coast Guard is charged with the protection and safety of our harbors. That is the only Government agency today which can patrol and police these ports. The Coast Guard has a peculiar and indispensable function to perform. The Canfield amendment should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, my home district borders on the Pacific coast in Los Angeles County. Therefore, I have had reason during the war and during peacetime to observe the operations of the Coast Guard in the great Los Angeles and Long Beach area. I think it is of distinct benefit for me to have that intimate personal knowledge of what the Coast Guard did in wartime as compared to you busy Members who live inland and do not have the chance to realize by personal observation the importance of the Coast Guard. Of course, the Coast Guard is in a strategic position and must always be in a position to effect a rapid transformation and to expand almost immediately to many times its peacetime strength in order to fulfill its role as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war. The key to this rapid necessary expansion for wartime service is the Coast Guard Reserve. The fact is that the circumstances during World War II are an illustration of the importance of the Coast Guard Reserve in wartime. For instance, prior to our entrance into the war the Coast Guard numbered less than 20,000 officers and men, but by VJ-day the military strength of the Coast Guard exceeded 20,000 officers and exceeded 172,000 persons; 144,000 of them were Coast Guard reservists.

In short, it only requires about 20,000 or 25,000 officers and men as a maximum to perform the peacetime duty of the Coast Guard. But another 150,000 Coast Guard reservists can be trained by not more than 25,000 officers. So I urge that some reasonable appropriation be made at this time to make this reserve effective. A beginning must be made.

I have the pleasure of serving on the very important Reserve Components Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I am a member of the subcommittee, and the chairman of that

committee is the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who has just given you such a vivid address. I urge some appropriation be made. I think it is wise and in the interest of our national security that it be done now.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I have visited in the gentleman's district, and I know the interest the gentleman has in the people and their well-being. Do you not think that even though their training could not be extensive, the building of an esprit de corps among these people is involved?

Mr. DOYLE. It is an absolute necessity. The assurance of immediate expansion is an important element in the Coast Guard. A reserve group is essential.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I am also a member of that subcommittee, and I want to pay tribute to the fine work which the gentleman from California is doing on that subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who is so sensitive to the needs of the armed services.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, today I speak to you but briefly of the tide and submerged lands measure relating to the tideland oil controversy as between the Federal Government and the respective States which the House Judiciary Committee recently voted favorably for and which is numbered H. R. 8137.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, introduced the measure—as I did in the Seventy-ninth session of Congress when there were only 11 votes in the House against the tide-lands bill—urging the State theory of title and interests in tide and submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California and other States. I shall again vigorously work for the passage of this bill, H. R. 8137.

I now again urge your favorable consideration thereof, and I urge that the Rules Committee grant the rule at the earliest possible date in order that this important measure shall come to the floor of Congress at the earliest possible date so that it may have adequate consideration and conclusive decision.

I know from inquiry that most of you have not had time to note that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States expressly included a recital that the question of ownership and control of these tide and submerged lands and natural resources is within the congressional area of national power and the Supreme Court of the United States, in its historic and precedent-making decision, also stated in substance and effect that Congress would, of course, not exercise its powers in such way as to bring about injustice to the States or subdivisions or to persons acting pursuant to the permission of these States and legal subdivisions.

As just a slight indication of the continued determination of the people of

my native State of California that its rights to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent should not be trespassed upon or converted to Federal use, I read you from a joint resolution, No. 8, passed by the Assembly of the State Legislature of the State of California on April 3, 1950, and by the Senate of the State Legislature of the State of California on April 12, 1950, and which was duly endorsed and filed in the office of the secretary of state of California on April 13, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m. and certified to by Frank M. Jordan, secretary of state of the State of California, as follows:

Whereas the United States has recognized that all the States since July 4, 1776, or since their admission to the Union, have, with full recognition from the Federal Government, exercised full powers of ownership over all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries and of all natural resources within these lands and waters; and

Whereas each State has maintained full control of its natural resources with the acquiescence and approval of the United States and in accordance with numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the executive departments of the United States that these lands and resources were vested in the respective States as an incident to State sovereignty and that the exercise of these powers of ownership and control did not and will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international relations; and

Whereas substantial sums of money have been expended by the several States, their subdivisions, and persons lawfully acting pursuant to State authority in improving and reclaiming lands, and in developing the natural resources in the lands and waters relying upon the recognized rule of State ownership; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers in respect to a portion of these lands and natural resources without reaffirming or settling the ultimate question of their ownership and control; and

Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the question of the ownership and control of these lands and natural resources is within the congressional area of national power and that Congress will not execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to the States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That it is in public interest and in the furtherance of justice that title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States be restored to and confirmed in these States by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved. That the Congress of the United States recognize, confirm and establish title to these lands in the States so concerned; and be it further

Resolved. That the Congress of the United States release and relinquish to these States all right, title and interest which the United States has in these lands; and be it further

Resolved. That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States.

And I ask that this very, very important resolution be included in my discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has expired.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by my able colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. We will be making a very serious blunder if we do not at least make a small start on the proper organization of the Coast Guard Reserve.

The need for this Reserve is well known and has been well and briefly stated by Lt. Walter K. Handy, Jr., in the following language:

In peacetime the Coast Guard, which is the smallest of the military services, operates under the Treasury Department as a law-enforcing, life-saving, life-protecting agency. It regulates and supervises the loading of dangerous cargoes, inspects vessels and enforces maritime safety regulations, and maintains search and rescue services, aids to navigation, weather stations, iceberg patrols and many other services for the safety of persons at sea and the protection of both lives and property in normal times and in time of disaster.

But the Coast Guard must always be prepared to undergo a rapid transformation, expanding to many times its peacetime size in order to fulfill its roles as a specialized service within the Navy in time of war. The key to this rapid expansion for wartime service is the Coast Guard Reserve. The experience during World War II is a vivid illustration of the importance of the reserve in wartime expansion. Prior to our entrance into the war the Coast Guard numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. By VJ-day the military strength of the Coast Guard exceeded 172,000 persons, of which about 144,000 were reservists. In short, it requires only about 20,000 to 25,000 officers and men to perform the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, but another 150,000 are necessary to carry out its wartime functions. And for these the Coast Guard must rely on its Reserve.

He went on to say:

Any adequate program for the protection of our ports must also make provision for well trained and organized identification specialists to screen and control the personnel having access to vessels and waterfront facilities.

Our ports are the "bottlenecks" through which supplies and men must flow in time of war. The destruction or impairment of any of these ports, whether accidentally or by sabotage, would seriously disrupt the flow of essential men and material. Therefore it is obvious that all possible precautions must be taken to protect them and the ships which use them, from any damage, otherwise all of our other defense preparations may be jeopardized or to a great extent nullified.

In order to give our ports this protection, the Coast Guard must be prepared to place on duty within a matter of hours sufficient numbers of men, thoroughly trained in all of the aspects of port security, to assure the complete safety of all port facilities and vessels from sabotage or accidental damage by fire or explosion. The Coast Guard can meet this responsibility only if it has promptly available a well trained Reserve which is prepared to assume its role in fulfilling the Coast Guard's responsibility at a moment's notice.

Mr. Chairman, I have been familiar with the operations of the Coast Guard both in peace and in wartime during a lifetime. During the Eightieth Congress, I had the privilege of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, and as a result of that experience, I think I know something of the need of the Reserve.

This need is recognized by the Secretary of Defense who on January 11, 1950, said that the reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserve was a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense. The Navy has assigned certain wartime missions to the Coast Guard, and this service in particular being a very small peacetime service must be in a position to expand rapidly and effectively. It can only do so by a proper organized reserve. Secretary Johnson said:

Accordingly, I desire to go on record as fully concurring with the request for the necessary funds for this purpose. While many of the wartime purposes of the Coast Guard are but large-scale expansions of its peacetime functions, such as aids to navigation, search and rescue, marine inspection and licensing, I am particularly perturbed about the security of our ports in the event of an emergency. It is vital to national defense that a modest but highly trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent water-front fires and explosions, control the identity of waterfront personnel, and so forth. I wish to emphasize that in my opinion the maximum need for this protection will be immediate upon a declaration of an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to add one cent to this bill, which is overloaded with the grossest kind of extravagance. Indeed, I would not support this measure except that I know that the comparatively small amount required can be produced by savings in other sections of the bill many times over. I shall not support the bill on its final passage in any event, unless the total appropriations are drastically reduced, but I am acutely conscious of the need for this amendment, and it would be a great and vital mistake if it is not adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize to the members of the committee that the amendment that we want to pass is the Fernandez amendment, to give this Coast Guard the \$4,000,000 to which they are entitled. Not the Canfield amendment, but the Fernandez amendment. If the Coast Guard is guilty of any sin—and all of us have sins—if the Coast Guard is guilty of any sin, it is the sin of not publicizing what it has done for this Nation.

I live on a seaport, the finest in the United States, as you know. During the war I saw what the Coast Guard did. They were in charge of the port security, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] who so capably, and with that master hand which he alone possesses, has told you what that Coast Guard has done; the combatant role which it played in all theaters during the war—convoy to Murmansk and others. Wherever there were scars in war, the Coast Guard

was there. They were in charge of our ports.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] said 26,000 was not a drop in the bucket. Let me say that if one Russian tramp steamer laid one atomic egg in New York, the people of that city, no one would live there again for generations. The Coast Guard alone protects our port installations and they will again in this age of the atom and hydrogen bomb. The Coast Guard is neglected like no other branch of the service. They are neglected to our everlasting shame. I am not going to be a party to that, and I do not think you are. The Coast Guard has no spokesman in this Nation. It has only its achievements gloriously written in the pages of history to remind an apathetic Nation of her part in the recent conflict. I could speak for hours and hours and hours to you, but my friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has told you the story.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Certainly.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am rather curious; why is it that no request for this appropriation was made in 1945 and 1946 after the war? And no request made for it in 1947 when the budget was balanced? And no request in 1948?

Mr. RIVERS. There is an old piece of poetry that goes like this:

God and the soldier we adore
In time of danger, not before.
Danger past and all things righted;
God forgotten and the soldier slighted.

That is human nature, to forget our benefactors. I am not going to be placed in that position. I know what the Coast Guard has done. I am going to be on their side making their fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is rather important to get a few things clear. During the course of the debate here I think a few misstatements have been made, probably not intentionally. If this is a new project, it is new in name only. I take it that we do not at this time have to bring up the necessary and important role that has been played by the Reserve, civilian component of our armed forces and how important they are in our national defense program. If they are not important, many of us right here on this floor have wasted many years of our lives.

One thing we should bear in mind is that the Reserves are a wartime contingent. Primarily, their only function is to serve in war; and while it is true that the Coast Guard has a peacetime function and does it very well, its reserve would be a wartime increment and an essential part. If it is to function, it must have money. While I believe in economy as much as any man in this House, I think it would be false economy to let the fine officers and men of the Coast Guard Reserve with battle training, graduates of the best school who learned things the hard way—in combat—die on the vine. It would be too

bad to let these veterans of the Coast Guard component, who served as Navy personnel in every sense of the word, except name, get rusty and deteriorate from lack of continued training. It would leave a blind spot in our national defense. If we need a naval reserve, we need a Coast Guard Reserve, and these veterans are the best men in the world to serve as the nucleus for it. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], seems confused as to the mission of the Coast Guard and their accomplishments. He says that if the enemy ever gets as near our gates as to require harbor defenses to keep them off, that all will be lost in this atomic age. That was not the case in the last two wars. The people of my State of Maryland remember very well the role played by the Coast Guard in this last war, when they saw actions fought just off the mainland, and the Coast Guard did a great deal in defending the coast line.

The gentleman from New York speaks of the millions that will be necessary to defend against atomic and other warfare. Who does he think will be able to train them in an emergency? We have reserves in all the armed components. These reserves must be made up of well trained men and men of experience. I think this is an economy measure, and while I want to see the budget cut wherever possible, I do not see how we can afford to cut it here. I urge the adoption of the Canfield amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Canfield amendment, and I am very glad and appreciative in behalf of the Coast Guard that the able gentleman from New Jersey has offered the amendment which is certainly in keeping with the effort of our country to prepare and to give the Nation the necessary things at the most economical price.

I have high respect and regard for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]; he and I have talked this matter over. I know he is conscientious; I know he is striving to do the best thing for this country; I know he is a businessman of keen intellect and realizes that the national budget must be balanced and that economies must be practiced. Yet there are all sorts of economies that can be had. Recently I addressed an association of firemen down in North Carolina and I spoke on the subject of the parallel between the fire department and our national defense in time of war and firemen in time of strife and disaster, pointing out that the duty of the firemen was to put the fire out and that afterward the underwriters and the civic societies would come in and rehabilitate. Likewise that it was the function of the Army to destroy our opponents.

Then the Government and the societies of Government came in to rehabilitate. I was urging that our foreign-aid program be maintained. The paper that wrote an editorial on my speech heads it "Things do not add up." They agree with that much of the address. Then they come down to a question that was

before the House this morning and they say:

Now, Mr. BONNER, there is a condition existing that one agency of the Government has walked out and left fine handsome buildings and another agency of the Government desires to build similar buildings within an area of 10 miles.

It speaks of a general hospital at Waltham, Mass., costing about \$15,000,000 and the Army and the National Defense having closed it down. Then the Veterans' Administration comes in and wants to build a new hospital within 10 miles of it, at a cost of ten million.

Mr. Chairman, that is the economy I want to practice. I am against any such procedure, and I am sorry this morning there was not a roll call on the veterans' hospital-construction bill. The Veterans' Administration should use available facilities, such as the hospital at Waltham and others that have been closed by the Army and Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Coast Guard in time of war protected all of our ports, and the Coast Guard Reserve is now functioning through the generosity of nationally public-minded citizens on behalf of the Nation. The Coast Guard should have this little drop in the bucket to train its personnel for future emergencies. I do hope that the Canfield amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II port security officers supervised the loading of about 29,000,000,000 pounds of explosives at American ports without a single explosion. These specially trained men were under the supervision of the Coast Guard. About 8,000 were required in Boston, 16,000 in New York, 4,000 in Philadelphia, 4,000 in Norfolk, 4,000 in Seattle, 1,200 in Chicago, and 8,000 in San Francisco.

The Coast Guard was scattered in spots all over the country and up and down our coasts. Therefore, they are in a strategic position to be the eyes and ears of our national defense. They are the first thought of the citizenry in peacetime disaster. They are on duty during both war and peacetime. I personally know members of the Coast Guard Reserve who drive 75 miles at their own expense to attend drills and training meetings. This amendment is just as essential as the dollars spent in the Marshall plan. Let us adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is recognized.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, the district which I have the honor to represent is stretched out over about 100 miles of coast line, much of which is heavily indented. It was visited on numerous occasions during the late war by German submarines. These came in very close to the shore, just how close we did not know at the time. It is not easy to identify the precise movements of a submarine. Our harbor mouth was closed by nets and entrances to Casco Bay were blocked by various obstacles. Indeed, I had to have a Coast Guard pass to go back and forth to my own home on an island in Portland Harbor.

The enemy submarines which visited us during the late war did not carry atomic bombs; they did not carry bombs of any kind, as far as I know. But if we are visited by enemy submarines in a future war, it is difficult to say what missiles they may carry.

The people in my district are very much interested in the Coast Guard. They rely on the protection which that organization can give them. They are very grateful for the protection which the Coast Guard has given them in the past and to my people at least a Coast Guard Reserve seems every bit as logical as a Naval Reserve. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is a very modest, prudent commitment for the training of a body of this sort.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] sneered at training a Coast Guard Reserve as if it were taking a few men, 26,000 of them—I think he said—on a picnic during the summer. I regret this attitude. There is no more reason for considering the training of a Coast Guard Reserve a picnic than for considering the training of the National Guard or the training of the Army or the training of the Naval Reserve as a picnic.

I repeat that the appropriation suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey in his amendment is in every way appropriate and proper. I hope that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. For 14 years I was the president of a military university which contested with the Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House when they approach items like this in the bill, will not vote in accordance with that definition of economy which says that economy is the practice of thrift by the elimination of governmental projects from the other Congressman's district.

I am one of those who served in the Coast Guard Reserve without compensation and without acquiring retirement or pension rights. I do not say that boastfully. I say it gratefully. It was my privilege, and I looked upon it as a privilege, to be able in that way to serve this country that has done so much for all of us.

Despite the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has derided this proposed amendment, the port of New York needs this appropriation and every port in the country needs it; every city and town on every navigable lake and river in this country needs this appropriation. And it is not something new; it is not a new program.

You authorized the establishment of a Coast Guard Reserve in February 1941, and before we could get it going we were in the war, and the Coast Guard was integrated into the Navy and operated throughout the war, until the

end of hostilities as part of the Navy. It then went back to the Treasury Department.

Last year they came forward and asked for an appropriation to the extent of \$3,500,000. Unfortunately they did not clear it with the Bureau of the Budget and could not get it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to say this, in completion of what I said before, and I know what I am talking about, that no graduate of West Point or no graduate of Annapolis can ever pass an entrance examination to the Coast Guard Academy.

A graduate of the Coast Guard Academy would find the entrance examination for West Point or Annapolis equally puzzling. What I mean to imply is that a Coast Guardsman is suigeneris. He is not and cannot be made in a minute. He is an invaluable asset to this country, both in times of peace and when at war.

We need the Coast Guard Reserve at the fullest possible strength at which it may reasonably be maintained. As I started to say I was in close contact with the Coast Guard for 14 years, and have been in contact with it since I came to Congress.

I am for economy, but to deprive the Coast Guard of the necessary funds to sustain its activities and preserve its reserve strength is not real economy.

Mr. MULTER. Gentlemen, this is not a new program. You are just catching up with yourselves in appropriating for the program you initiated and authorized some time back. We have been told that the Secretary of Defense has recommended the program; the President has; the Secretary of the Navy has. In that connection I want to call your attention to the fact that the Navy Department says in so many words that this training program of the United States Coast Guard will not duplicate in any way the training now being given by the Naval Reserve.

I am not talking merely for New York. Let me tell you what Seattle thinks of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, and thank him for so graciously granting me his time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I am in wholehearted support of this appropriation of \$4,100,000 for the Coast Guard Reserve. Much has been said here today about port security and the work the Coast Guard handles, and the tributes that have been

paid to the Coast Guard by the gentleman from Missouri and other Members of the House. Coming from Philadelphia and representing the second largest port in the country, we are very much concerned about this strong link in our national defense, and I hope that the Members of this House do not neglect their duty and will give to the Coast Guard Reserve what they are entitled to and what the country is very much in need of.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the Seattle Times has this to say about this proposed appropriation:

As a seaport city, Seattle is genuinely concerned over congressional neglect to provide any adequate training program for reservists of the United States Coast Guard. It is that service which is called on in an emergency to shoulder responsibility for the security of port facilities here and in every coastal city. * * *

It makes little difference whether this training is carried out as part of the Navy Reserve program, since the Coast Guard becomes a part of the Navy in war, or by the Coast Guard itself. The point is that an adequate training program should be set up.

This is your opportunity to set it up, and I say set it up for \$4,100,000 and not for \$1,000,000, because the maximum you will use in any year for this training program is \$8,000,000. Pay no attention to the argument about getting your foot into the door or your nose under the tent. This Congress controls these appropriations year in and year out, and if the department ever gets to the point of requesting more than \$8,000,000 we can say, "You have enough."

It is intended to train a maximum of 2,400 officers and some twenty-six thousand-odd men, a total of approximately 29,000 men to be able to make available a maximum wartime personnel of close to 200,000 men to do this work that no other facility, no other department of Government is doing or can do to secure our ports and our navigable rivers against invasion and against sabotage.

Let me point out to you the following:

Our national defense is quite adequately provided for except in one all-important area, the harbor and waterfront areas of the United States.

In this one area, necessarily the bottleneck in our chain of defense, we have made no provisions whatsoever for the training and maintaining of a port-security force that must be completely effective the instant an emergency arises.

With the high concentration of subversive elements known to exist in our harbor areas, it is a foregone conclusion that lacking adequate port security we could very well lose the struggle before we got started.

The Coast Guard Reserve is composed of all types of highly skilled specialists. Professional men whose daily work is very similar to the duties of port-security personnel, and if a training program is provided for, our harbor security could very well be effected by that organization.

Public Law 810 provides that military personnel be given an opportunity to

qualify for retirement by participation in reserve programs, and all reserve organizations are well provided for except the Coast Guard Reserve, where no provision has been made at all.

The Secretary of the Navy delegated to the Coast Guard at the outbreak of World War II, the responsibility of port security.

The skills required in maintaining security, and insuring full capacity operation of our ports throughout the Nation, are considerably different than those required for other military services.

Fire prevention, a very highly specialized type of duty, requiring the services of fire-prevention engineers.

Fire fighting, from both land side and water side, requires special technique, and the fighting of water-front fires is considered the most difficult type of such duty.

Explosive loading, another duty of port-security forces, is highly specialized, requiring the most careful selection and training of personnel to properly supervise this very hazardous duty. It might be well to note that no explosions occurred in any vessel supervised by the Coast Guard in loading 29,482,753,800 pounds of explosives.

The identification of all persons requesting access to water-front activities is a tremendous task, requiring the interrogation, fingerprinting, and photographing of hundreds of thousands of persons, and of course calls for specially trained personnel.

The control and licensing of the movement of vessels within the harbor, to insure maximum use of all port facilities, requires constant study and, as water-front activities develop, the planning must constantly change.

Supervision of the loading of tankers, still another duty of the port-security force, is required to be done by the Coast Guard.

Boarding, inspection, and sealing of radios on all merchant shipping expands the peacetime functions of the Coast Guard, and requires that a sizable force be constantly trained to take over these duties instantly and not days after an emergency is declared.

The very high concentration of communistic and subversive elements in and near water-front activities require that port-security forces be kept constantly aware of the situation so that when an emergency does exist we may be sure that our harbors will not be paralyzed.

Port-security training is, in effect, an insurance against sudden and immediate collapse of our shipping if war is declared.

The Coast Guard Reserve is composed of highly trained specialists in all these fields of endeavor. The errors, lost motion, and duplication of effort, all the result of inadequate advanced planning prior to World War II have been discovered and eliminated and presently the Coast Guard Reserve has over 100 training units, established and staffed entirely on a voluntary basis ready to do any and every thing possible to train port-security personnel capable of over-

night securing the harbors and shipping against the violent attacks from subversive elements that will surely come at the outbreak of a war.

These reservists are largely persons who cannot give more than their time to this important defense work, and it is imperative that sufficient money be available to support the training program.

This training program will enable the Coast Guard to expand their normal peacetime functions, and utilize the Reserve HFDF, vessel augmentations, aids to navigation, and loran stations.

This \$4,000,000 request was originally submitted by the President and was supported by both the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee should definitely understand we already have a Coast Guard Reserve. There are 5,000 officers and men who are members of the Coast Guard Reserve and who try to maintain their efficiency as specialists in particular fields by attending weekly drills on a volunteer basis. These Coast Guard reserves receive nothing in return for their drilling except the satisfaction they get out of it and the maintenance of their efficiency and retirement credits provided they have completed the required numbers of satisfactory years and receive an honorable discharge.

In addition to the Coast Guard reserves we have the reserves of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marines, the majority of whom are paid for drills. They are paid one-thirtieth of their monthly base pay for every drill that they attend. Therefore I think that you will agree it is unfair to pay reserves of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines for drills and ask the Coast Guard reserves to perform their drills without any pay.

Who are these 5,000 Reserve officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard Reserve? They are specialists in port security, high frequency direction finding, aids to navigation, loran, communications, and search and rescue. In time of emergency these specialists would become part of the Navy. They would train groups of men in various fields who in turn would be distributed to naval units either at shore installations or on board ship. In other words, these Coast Guard specialists are today the nucleus of a part of tomorrow's Navy.

Let me stress the fact that any Reserve officer regardless of his branch of service cannot maintain his efficiency by merely attending drills.

In addition to drills he must take 15 days' active training duty during the summer. Unless the money provided for in this amendment is made available these Coast Guard reserves will not only drill without pay but they will be unable to take their training cruises in the summer. Thus they will be denied actual ex-

perience with modern military devices, and will not be adequately trained to take their places in the Coast Guard in time of war. I speak from experience because I command a brigade of Navy reserves consisting of 2,900 officers making up 59 divisions. Once every week these men attend drills for the purpose of maintaining their efficiency. Therefore we should provide the same incentive for the Coast Guard reserves if we expect them to maintain their efficiency.

The Coast Guard reserves are a part of our national defense. If you read the table of organization set up by the Civilian Components Policy Board for the Reserves of our country you will find the Coast Guard reserves mentioned. You will also find we have provided for the Coast Guard practically every benefit now enjoyed by the reserves in the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force, except providing drill pay and training duty in the summer.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that in an appropriation of this size for a purpose so worthy and a service so necessary there should be such a controversy raised. I am usually on the side of cutting down the appropriations. But this is real, sound economy to my way of thinking. Wise national preparedness is sound economy when the money is wisely and honestly spent. The American people do not object to that. This money in my opinion certainly comes in that category.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused over this question of economy here when I see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the Democratic chairman, yielding all his time to the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican member—to be used against the amendment providing one million for the Coast Guard Reserve. That makes me wonder where the rest of us come in on this ship.

Let me say that at the beginning of this second war few people realized that every night the Germans were within gunshot of our shores. I have stood on the shore of North Carolina and listened to their guns, to the explosions which sounded like a front-line battle going on. They sank as many as 14 indispensable ships in a single week. I stood there on the coast when there was not a Navy ship within a hundred miles, and I saw as many as three big ships burning at one time. We did not have an active Coast Guard Reserve organization to start with. The Navy had taken the regular trained Coast Guard men and left the coast line in the hands of untrained, unequipped men. They did their best—but had an impossible task.

It does not make any sense to me to fuss over a million dollars to encourage and maintain a good Coast Guard Reserve. I fear some people are putting too much faith in the billions we are pouring overseas. I prefer the policy of

taking care of our own needs first, and then, if we have some to give away, we can give that consideration later. I am supporting the gentleman's amendment for \$1,000,000. I think they can start with that and can encourage the program already in motion. Let us encourage this organization, which in my opinion will pay enriched dividends in the defense of America.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. They requested \$4,100,000—

Mr. BARDEN. Now, let me stop right there. That is your amendment. The gentleman is a very delightful Member of this House. He is very wise, and certainly everybody knows he is interested in this Government, but I do not want to yield very much time to a Member who offers an amendment and then says he is not going to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

THE COAST GUARD RESERVES

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, no member of this committee is more concerned with the increasing cost of Government and the necessity for relieving the now excessive tax burden on the people of this country which already is choking the life out of the incentive to do business in many instances, than I. But with the information coming from reliable sources relative to the possibility of war, it does seem to me that port security should receive most serious consideration immediately and the amendment now being offered to provide funds for furnishing necessarily trained personnel in this very important work receives my unqualified support because in the event of the outbreak of war, protection of our ports from damage or destruction by sabotage, explosion of munitions, or fire will be of primary importance; and to accomplish this the measures through which port security is achieved will include the continuous use of antisabotage patrols and inspection, supervision of the handling and loading of explosives from freight cars to pier and vessel, and the prevention and fighting of fires.

All of these are highly specialized and technical duties requiring extensive training and constant instruction in modern equipments, in weapons, munitions, techniques, and other factors affecting them. This training must be provided in advance of an emergency in order that the personnel responsible for port security will be prepared to assume their duties within the shortest possible number of minutes or hours in the event of an emergency. If the port-security specialists are not prepared to be on the job within a matter of minutes or hours, and if such an organization is not constantly alert, a crippling blow could be struck by the damaging or destruction of our ports in the earliest stages of any conflict.

During World War II we were fortunate in that there was no extensive and well organized enemy infiltration into our ports for sabotage. This, and the delay

in getting our production and overseas movements of materials and men actively under way, provided time for the expansion and adequate training of the Coast Guard Reserve which has been created in 1941. We are not likely to be fortunate enough again to have so much time for organization and training at the last minute. Furthermore, those who were closest to the rush of last-minute preparations during World War II will tell you that it is anything but an effective, satisfactory or safe way to do the job. Our port security specialists must be highly trained in advance if they are to do us any good in any possible emergency. It is a matter of record that during World War II the Coast Guard, in addition to its participation in every major invasion, established port security organizations in over 75 ports in the United States, including every major port, and as the war progressed, assumed those functions in our advance base ports overseas. It required a minimum of approximately 16,000 officers and men for these duties in the port of New York, 8,000 in Boston, 4,000 in Philadelphia, 4,000 in Norfolk, 1,200 in Chicago, 8,000 in San Francisco, 4,000 in Seattle, and 2,900 in Baltimore, to cite but a few examples. These port security specialists supervised the loading of about 29,000,000 pounds of explosive without a single explosion. This involved the enforcement of specified safety measures in handling explosives, supervision and approval of stowage areas and methods, determination and enforcement of limitations as to type of explosives and other dangerous cargoes which could be stowed together, or which must be separated by specified distances, stowed in specified locations aboard ship, and so forth.

In addition, the port security specialists were successful in detecting and preventing various acts of sabotage, they also discovered and brought under control literally hundreds of fires in ports which might otherwise have been disastrous, and in at least one instance played an important part in preventing the demolition of port facilities by the spread of a raging pier fire to an ammunition-loading area. These few examples of their activities in the last war will give some idea of a few of the vital functions of the port security specialists.

It therefore seems to me that trained personnel for port security should be available upon a moment's notice and should be a must in our defense program, and I hope the pending amendment receives favorable consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is recognized.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fernandez amendment for an adequate appropriation for the United States Coast Guard and its Reserve. It is an integral part of our Nation's reserve forces. The United States Coast Guard is responsible for the security of the ports in event of an emergency and the security of our ports is very vital. This means that we must have well organized and thoroughly trained personnel ready at any time to fulfill this re-

sponsibility within a matter of minutes, or hours at the most. For this the Coast Guard must rely on a highly trained and specialized Reserve because of its small peacetime size and the specialized and technical nature of its port security functions. This responsibility can only be fulfilled by providing adequate funds for training the Coast Guard Reserve.

The Coast Guard alone is being relied upon for port security and no other agency is preparing for it. Our ports are the "bottlenecks" through which men and supplies must be moved. Adequate provision for port security is especially important in view of the known Communist infiltration into water-front areas. The harbor and water-front areas of the United States are definitely very important areas and, unless there is adequate provision made for their security, a serious gap in our national defense will exist.

I understand that in accordance with the provisions of law by which the Coast Guard is to operate under the Navy during any future national emergency, the Navy has assigned certain vital wartime missions to the Coast Guard. It is therefore very apparent that the proposed amendment providing an appropriation for the maintenance of the United States Coast Guard and its Reserve is a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, I desire to go on record as fully concurring with the request for the necessary funds to enable the Coast Guard Reserve to continue its work. Representing a section of Baltimore, I am particularly concerned about the security of our port, in the event of an emergency as well as other ports throughout the country, and strongly feel that these funds should be made available in order that this effective group can continue to function.

Although I have consistently urged economy in all phases of Government, there is such a thing as foolhardy reduction in the expenditures of our national defense. To fail to provide sufficiently for the Coast Guard and its Reserve would weaken the defense of our borders.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to join in the thoughts expressed by my colleague from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and possibly to add another thought. In considering this legislation most of the debate has been directed to our ports being attacked from the side adjacent to the water. We all know that these ports are probably the most sensitive spots to sabotage. We know that the Coast Guard Reserve, in its training, has been geared to the protection of American ports and American shipping, and the safeguarding of our harbors. We know that the Coast Guard in the recent war came out of that war with a great record. I think the first man in my county who gave his life in that conflict was a member of the United States Coast Guard.

In the matter of economy we should look to what is the actual saving. We

know that in America we cannot keep an armed force to measure up with the ability to go immediately into war; that it must expand. The most inexpensive way to expand is through these reserves, the Naval Reserve, the Army Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

I hope that this \$4,000,000 appropriation will be placed in the bill in order that this important reserve may be continued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that I am as typical a militiaman as anyone could be. Prior to joining the Marine Corps in 1917 I had had some training which was not exactly militia but still it provided the fundamentals of military knowledge sufficiently to give me a long head start when I first began my recruit training.

After the First World War I came into the Marine Corps Reserve and continued my military training. In 1936, just before the Second World War began, I took command of a Reserve battalion, and in 1940 we were called to active duty. We were the largest of any of the Marine Corps Reserve battalions excepting one. Personally, I spent 5½ years on active duty during World War II.

Our people were scattered throughout the Marine Corps, and some of them were in every major engagement. It is extremely significant that out of that battalion we lost only 13 men. The rest all came back.

There is no old soldier within the sound of my voice who would not agree with me that these men, to a great degree, are alive because of the early training they received. I have seen it work in two wars. The trained men are just not as apt to get hurt as the untrained. I do not think that anyone will disagree with that concept; and so we need not pursue it further.

I believe that the Coast Guard Reserve was eliminated from the appropriations bill because members of the committee did not realize that it is, in fact, an integral part of our national defense.

I believe that if you thought that national safety, or individual safety, would be served by members of the Coast Guard Reserve you would very promptly provide the extremely moderate sum which has been requested for their training.

Now, let me give you a very quick but very clear example of the sort of work that these men must do if it is to be done in the event one of our ports is subjected to an attack.

Just 3 years ago Sunday, the 16th, a ship exploded in Texas City Harbor, just 10 miles from my home. You may possibly be able to imagine the force of it when I tell you that the Army later estimated it to be about half of the force of the early atomic bombs. I started to Texas City in my car. After getting clear of the city of Galveston and upon reaching the open coastal plain that separates us from Texas City it was immediately apparent that there had been a major disaster. I could visualize the three highways leading to and from

Texas City—each is a two-lane artery—and I knew that with fire and rescue apparatus trying to get into the area and the injured trying to get out congestion would be terrific.

Many others had followed my impulse and were on the way to Texas City and accordingly, I turned back, stopping at a radio station to ask them to broadcast an appeal for people to stay off those highways. My Marine Corps training prompted me then to go and report in to the community disaster headquarters in order to get some kind of an orderly assignment where I was needed the most.

It is well known to military men that one of the hardest tasks that confronts them is the handling of the civilian population which is displaced in the event of an attack. They are hard to regulate; they are not amenable to discipline; they add to the confusion; and they may very well be the turning point in the theater of operation. This proved to be the major hazard in Texas City. Fortunately, it was very soon after the end of the war. There were many well-trained ex-soldiers available. The veterans' organizations; the veterans' groups quickly organized; the Army sent troops from nearby stations; the major cities of Texas sent uniformed police; the National Guard had not yet reorganized, but members of the State guard were made available. However, all this could not be accomplished without a delay of many hours.

In that time, there was no way of estimating the number of people who died because they could not be brought out through the congested traffic and taken to the nearest hospitals. There is no way of telling how much property would have been saved in the fire that followed had more apparatus been rushed to the scene in the early stages. And so, there in that community of some 30,000 people, we had a striking object lesson of exactly what will happen on a much greater scale if someday a tramp steamer pulls into New York or Philadelphia or Boston or Baltimore harbor—ties up at a dock and then proceeds to set off an atomic bomb which has been hidden in the hold.

Again, there will be, as in Texas City, the need for immediate taking over of the waterfront and adjacent areas. Trained men to do the job must be available immediately to assume control of the stricken area; to get people out who must be removed; and to keep people away who have no business there. This is a mission assigned to the Coast Guard.

The difference between the future cases and the Texas City disaster will be that following the explosion there will be some kind of an attack. It may be through a landing of some sort from submarines or surface craft; it may be from the air; still more likely, it may be from subversive elements who right now are mingling with us and who seem so naturally to gravitate to our waterfronts.

It is to cope with this situation that we need a trained Coast Guard Reserve. This is their job. There is no more important function in any element of our national defense. To close our eyes to their importance in times like these may

be the difference between success or failure of the initial attack on our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I had never thought, as a new Member of this body, that I would be called upon to take the floor of the House at such an early date, but I am happy that it comes on this particular subject about which I have a slight background of experience, having served in the Coast Guard Reserve during the recent war in the capacity of an explosive-loading officer and security officer in my home city of San Francisco.

I have been a little fearful of the remarks of those Members who, while opposing the amendment, extend sympathy to the cause. It is not sympathy that the Coast Guard or its reserve components want; it is understanding. I believe that if the Members understood the purpose of this amendment and the use to which this organization was put, the amendment would receive the unanimous vote of the Committee and certainly would stand up when the bill reaches the House.

We all know that during peacetime the Coast Guard, though an essential component of our armed forces, functions as a part of the Treasury Department. Immediately upon the outbreak of war it is integrated with the Navy and its operations are enormously expanded. Such was the case in December of 1941. The small force of the Regular Coast Guard was assigned the responsibility for port security and harbor patrol—in itself a tremendous job in wartime. In addition it developed that the Coast Guard was the only force that had knowledge of, and effective training in, amphibious operations—destined to be a most crucial part of offensive phases of the war. Obviously, the Regular forces could not be sufficiently expanded with the speed required to effectively handle both types of activities. The Regular Coast Guard and its Regular Reserve men were more than soaked up by shore duty. In this emergency a temporary reserve was set up for security operations on shore and in the auxiliaries afloat. With all modesty as a member of that temporary reserve, they performed yeoman service throughout the war. Some of those men are still organized on a voluntary basis without pay. All of those who served during the war were unpaid and were released without official recognition fitting the services performed—recognition which they richly deserve and which should still be forthcoming, although extended discussion of that issue has no place here.

Fortunately the efficiency of organization was such that no catastrophes occurred in the operations under its supervision. The temporary reserve group was composed, as far as officers were concerned, mostly of civil engineers from the fire underwriters or large industrial plants and from the explosives manufacturing plants around the country, men of technical knowledge and skill in their fields. They were possessed of the special training required to supervise the dangerous loading operations performed. They had to be. It is easy to say, if

a fire breaks out on board a ship amongst dangerous material, "Put the fire out"; but what most people do not know is the great importance of a knowledge of just how to fight fire when it breaks out in specific dangerous materials, because some normally used fire-fighting materials, as water, only spread the fire and make it burn more fiercely. The officers were trained how to handle explosives, trained how to fight fires, trained how to supervise men, how to check crew members, how to identify various people who have a right to enter and leave docks, and to take over until trained intelligence men or the FBI come on the scene.

Such training was a difficult and necessarily hurried procedure during the last war. When we consider the much greater variety of scientifically developed fire and explosion hazards which must be met if we are again plunged into war the need for a carefully and foresightedly developed permanent program of training for a permanent reserve force becomes obvious. We need only think of the atomic and hydrogen bombs and their related developments to realize the truth of that statement. Equally as serious is the fact that in any likely future war the enemy will without question have forces, both within our borders and without, trained especially for the purpose of bringing the full force of those hazards to play in our ports and harbors, the very place where the proposed Coast Guard Reserve training program would prepare a trained defense force to cope with them.

In view of these considerations I say that we would be criminally derelict in our duty to provide for the effective defense of this country should we fail to take the necessary steps contemplated by the amendment under consideration, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I think the gentleman's amendment has considerable merit and I shall be glad to vote for it when the proper time comes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

It is in my humble judgment neither sound economy nor wise national defense policy to cripple the Coast Guard at this critical time.

There is a volume of conclusive evidence concerning the splendid achievements of the Coast Guard and its many solid contributions to the national defense and civil safety which I will not now recite.

It is very difficult to appraise the real value of this most efficient and useful branch of the armed services. Its mettle has been tested and proved both in war and peace. It is at once an arm of the national defense and an invaluable

adjunct of our merchant marine—guardian of our shores, protector of our sea lanes, insurer of our navigation, cultivator of our youth who aspire to maritime service. I cannot possibly praise too highly the record, service, and tradition of our unexcelled Coast Guard.

I would not question the motives of those who have sought to effect such sharp reductions in this appropriation. Unquestionably they intend to stand for economy and efficiency in conducting the affairs of the Government and I am wholeheartedly in favor of that objective. But I sincerely believe that it is a danger to the national security to weaken or impair the functions of this service, particularly at a time when the international situation is fraught with every element of crisis and gravity.

I hope this House will never in any instance be blind to that situation. I hope my able, patriotic colleagues will recognize that our Nation is already deeply enmeshed in a Marxist-spun web of intrigue, conspiracy, and peril that may ultimately, if not sooner than we think, entwine us from all sides and bring a repetition of the awesome days of not long ago.

That, I trust and pray, divine providence will enjoin. But I want this Nation to be adequately prepared.

I will vote to restore the cuts which have been made in the Coast Guard appropriation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COVERT] who did not hear the testimony presented to the subcommittee on this item expresses wonder as to what the Coast Guard Reserve could do for his home city of New York. May I say in answer that in World War II a Coast Guardsman did a most heroic and important job for the city of New York when he discovered the Nazi saboteurs on Long Island.

The gentleman from New Mexico who is also a member of our subcommittee and who has now proposed an amendment to my amendment, his amendment calling for \$4,100,000, surprises me because in committee he was wholly and totally opposed to this entire matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am still opposed to starting that program now but I am dead serious when I say if we do it, let us do it properly and adequately. I think this is such an important matter it ought to be passed on by the committee and I think the gentleman and I have accomplished that purpose by bringing the matter to the floor today.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we tried to effect a compromise in the subcommittee. Yet the gentleman was opposed to it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And I am still opposing it.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman opposed anything for a Coast Guard Reserve.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am still opposed to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. After spending 9½ years in the Navy, I recognize the vital importance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and I shall support it.

The Coast Guard, like its brothers in the armed services, must be prepared to undergo a rapid transformation in the event of war to fulfill the tasks to which it has been assigned. I consider it most unwise economy not to provide for the security of the country through the medium of the functions assigned to this great organization. I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, let me say in closing that Admiral Richmond, Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, came to my office at my request regarding this appropriation. I suggested \$1,500,000. He said, "Let us make it a million." He wrote the amendment.

Only a short time ago Admiral O'Neill, now Commandant of the Coast Guard, called my office to say he was supporting only one amendment on this floor and that amendment is known as the Canfield amendment calling for an appropriation of \$1,000,000.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. First, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for offering this amendment on the floor today. It seems to me that to leave the Coast Guard out of our over-all national defense program does not make sense. Russia's possession of the atomic bomb makes all of our coast lines vulnerable to attack and it only makes sense, it seems to me, if we go forward with this reserve program so that we can provide adequate port security.

Mr. CANFIELD. And the gentleman will support my amendment which will provide for the training of 900 officers and 4,000 men. I hope it will prevail for the best interests of the United States.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LATHAM. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the able gentleman from New Jersey and say that I know of the splendid work these Coast Guard Reserve men have done in the past and are doing today. I think they should be given every encouragement and I am for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let us not kill it by voting for the substitute amendment. If you want the Coast Guard to get these funds, vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is of the utmost importance for national defense that we keep our house in order and see just what we are doing every time we move. We ought to have a pretty good picture of this situation before we embark upon a program that is going to grow, and grow, and grow.

At the present time—and I am supporting it—there is an army reserve costing \$115,000,000 a year. That item has been recommended for an increase in the bill that you have before you of \$5,000,000 above the budget. The Navy has a reserve costing \$67,000,000, and that item is contained in the bill that you have before you. The Air Force has a reserve costing \$73,000,000 and that item is in the bill which you have before you.

In 1939 and 1940 we had a total personnel in the Coast Guard itself of 10,000. In 1940, because of the requirement for neutrality patrol, that figure was raised to 13,641. In 1941, after we passed the Lend-Lease bill and all of us realized that we were getting into war, it was increased to 19,036.

Presently we have in the Coast Guard, and I call your attention to page 73 of the committee report, 20,240 enlisted men, 2,020 commissioned officers, 794 warrant officers and 459 cadets. In the fiscal year 1940 the total appropriation for the Coast Guard was about \$20,000,000 for pay and allowances. In this bill that we have before us the pay and allowances run into figures approaching \$100,000,000. Just to indicate how we have progressed in other activities, in 1939—and frankly, every one who thinks seems to realize that our greatest danger would be from within rather than without—the FBI had 789. In 1941 they had 2,131. This year they have 4,109. Next year in the pending bill they are given 4,354.

Anyone who thinks can see we have not been unmindful of our obligations to build up the Coast Guard big enough to take care of our situation. As against the 1939 figure we have more than doubled. As against the 1941 figure we have 4,000 more than we had then, when we knew we were approaching war and were preparing for it. Actually there was shooting out on the high seas in front of our very shores in which our ships were shot at and our ships replied.

We are not in that kind of a situation. We are not in a situation where there is a demand to immediately take care of an increased activity of another organization which it is here proposed to start. I am not and never have been unmindful of my obligations to support proper appropriations for national defense. But let me say to you unless we use our heads and approach this thing from the standpoint of whether or not we absolutely need to start something like this we will be making an appropriation of the people's money which is not warranted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. If this million dollars should be added to the bill would that amount be paid out of revenues already available or would the adoption of the amendment mean that we would have to borrow another million dollars and add that amount to the national debt?

Mr. TABER. It would mean borrowing another million dollars which it is going to be hard to get unless the Congress realizes its responsibility and keeps the appropriations in this bill and in other bills as well as authorization bills down.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the fact that this bill is being cut in many places and being cut deeply for items which we need but forego because we cannot afford, does the gentleman think the million dollars involved here could be used for other purposes to greater advantage?

Mr. TABER. I think if there is to be any addition to this bill there are other places which are more urgent. Frankly, here is the situation. We have \$67,000,000 in this bill for the Navy Reserve. If we have hostilities the Navy will take over the Coast Guard and those folks who are in the Naval Reserve can be used in the Coast Guard immediately and bring up their personnel immediately to do anything that is necessary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I have been in the Naval Reserve for 33 years and I am not qualified to handle certain gadgets employed by the Coast Guard in time of peace.

Mr. TABER. Yes, but the gadgets employed by the Coast Guard in time of peace are not going to have to be amplified in any very marked degree in time of war. It is only those activities of the Coast Guard such as running down submarines and such extraordinary military functions which will be thrown on the Coast Guard. The activities are pretty well separated when you get down to action.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROOKS) there were—ayes 18, noes 101.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANFIELD and Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 74, noes 62.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. CANFIELD to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for postal operations, not otherwise provided for, and for other activities conducted by the Post Office Department pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; a health service program as authorized by law; \$500,000 to be available exclusively for manufacture and procurement of improved devices for postal operations and other activities; \$7,013,000 to be available exclusively for the purchase of trucks, tractors, and trailers; leasing of space, not exceeding a term of 10 years, for the storage and care of vehicles;

and repair of vehicles owned by, or under control of, units of the National Guard and departments and agencies of the Federal Government where repairs are made necessary because of utilization of such vehicles in the postal service; \$1,786,000,000.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LARCADE: On page 113, line 4, strike out "\$1,786,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,808,000,000."

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, following the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE], the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose and effect of the amendment which I am offering is to make available to the Post Office Department \$22,000,000 additional under the postal appropriations under title III—Post Office Department, to provide sufficient funds to avoid the discontinuance of mail deliveries and reduction in number of employees expected under the directive of the Postmaster General just issued, and which will become effective on July 1.

Mr. Chairman, without any criticism or reflection on the committee, and while I realize that the members of the committee have worked hard and arduously in considering not only this particular appropriation and all others in an effort to make economies in the operation of the governmental agencies, I think that you will agree with me that the reaction to the announcement of the directive of the Postmaster General has brought a deluge of protests and opposition to the curtailment of this important and necessary postal service.

From the information that I have at this time, the resentment is country-wide and protests are increasing to the Members of Congress with every mail.

While I know that in making the recommendation to economize by reducing the delivery of mail that the committee was sincere and that they will almost unanimously defend their position in this matter, the situation now takes the turn where pressure and demand for the continuation of mail delivery rests entirely upon the Members of Congress. The Postmaster General in issuing his directive for the curtailment of mail delivery and the reduction in force of mail carriers is simply carrying out a recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and the blame now rests directly upon the Congress, and in my opinion, can only be remedied by the

Congress returning the amount by increasing the appropriation to the amount of my amendment to continue this service to the people of this country.

If the Congress does not reinstate the amount suggested it will mean that there will be approximately 10,000 mail carriers who will lose their positions and mail deliveries will be reduced—a service which our people have had for many years, and which service they desire to be continued. I am advised that \$22,000,000 is all that is required.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from an editorial taken from the Southwest Citizen, published in Lake Charles, the principal city in my district, commenting on this proposal:

REAL ECONOMY ON THE WAY?

Our Government continues to move in a mysterious way its wonders to perform. Now we are advised that as of July 1, deliveries of mail will be reduced, in some cases, to once a day.

Those of you who have read this column regularly know that we are firmly in favor of Government economy. Repeatedly, here, we have mentioned the top-heavy character of our sprawling Federal bureaucracy and have wondered whether all the jobs and all the services are necessary.

We have discussed the famous Hoover Commission Report in which reorganization of various Federal departments and agencies was suggested with the purpose of increasing efficiency and saving money for taxpayers. Most of the Hoover recommendations we have favored.

We have consistently supported elimination of the frills in Government spending, of cutting back Federal expenses by abolishing duplications and services that are not essential to our way of life.

Yet, taken suddenly with the urge to economize, our Government orders reduction in the one department that performs an intimate service for all the people.

There are few citizens, indeed, who will not concede readily that the Post Office Department has done a remarkably fine job. It has been equal to even the most trying occasions—such as were prevalent during the war when the V-mail plan was an outstanding success. It has operated for years with outmoded equipment—some of its rolling stock is more than 20 years old—and in cramped space—witness our own situation in Lake Charles where space is scarcely adequate for a city half our size.

Periodically, criticism is leveled at the Department because it does not operate at a profit. The criticism is true—but in these days of bureaucratic freedom with a dollar, how many other departments are in the black? Why must the Post Office Department, which serves directly millions of Americans, be singled out in this regard?

Now, we are not saying that economy is not a fine thing. We are not contending that our way of life will collapse if mail service is cut in half. But we think it very odd indeed that the boom should be lowered on the Post Office Department, where the economy ax would be felt most quickly by all Americans.

And we submit further that if the Government is serious about economizing (and you can form your own opinion on that), why could not a dozen other services, far less valuable to the individual citizen, have been selected for the initial reduction?

If Congress is actually earnest about reducing Federal expenses, it would seem logical that slashes would be ordered in places and in ways that would not affect the average citizen in so drastic a manner. It would seem logical, too, that some coordination in the proposed reductions would be in evidence. So far, the existence of this

sort of over-all economic plan is not apparent to the naked, unaided eye.

So, gentlemen, what gives? Is this a bona fide economy program or is it a devious stratagem to prompt the public to protest against economy, perhaps for use in some obscure way against other reductions of expense and on the theory that the one way to evade a real economy program is to prove in advance that it won't work? Is it to be expected that services of other departments also will be reduced by half or was the Post Office Department singled out simply for trial-balloon purposes?

One thing is sure. The master minds behind the order to reduce mail service had better be fast with a follow-through. Americans generally are watching and will be quick to resent it if the Post Office Department, which has given us all long and faithful service though often treated as a stepchild, proves to be the only victim of misguided economy.

If we are going to have economy, let's do it right. Let's avoid a hodgepodge, patchwork job that in the end will cost us even more money. If we are not going to economize, let's not single out the department that is performing a useful service for everyone; rather, if we are going to continue spending money we haven't got and won't get in our own lifetimes, let's not have only one mail delivery a day, let's have three.

We don't see why the people should have to put up with curtailed mail service if they are not assured of similar curtailments all down the line.

The Crowley Daily Signal had the following to say editorially about this matter:

TONS AND TONS AND TONS

In order to wipe out a postal deficit, the Post Office Department is cutting down on local deliveries and laying off employees. The post office is a basic public service and is not supposed to be a money-making proposition. But when the basic postal delivery and service itself is sacrificed in the name of economy, consideration must be given to problems which cause such drastic curtailment.

We maintain the annual postal deficit would be negligible if the post office confined its effort to the handling of mail and services for which there was a charge. But, when the Post Office Department has to carry the mail for the entire Government without cost, there is going to be a terrific deficit. Tons and tons and tons of mailing pieces daily flood the post offices of the country from Government bureaus, departments, and offices. The franking privileges of our legislators are a stupendous item in itself when it comes to figuring up mailing costs which have to be absorbed by the Post Office Department. Every one of the multifarious Federal agencies, and every one of their thousands of branch offices, who send mail free puts a tremendous expense upon the post office.

With all of this free Government mailing, the post office will continue to show a great deficit. It is not fair to charge all of this free service against the post office and then make the local offices cut down on service and employees in order to reduce the deficit. If all this free Government mailing would be charged for at regular postal rates and then charged against the department or person using the free service, the annual post office statement would not show such a deficit. It is odd at this time of deficit spending by the Government, that the post office is trying to show something of a profit statement. It is so unusual. If the post office charged this free service to the departments which used it at regular rates, there would be less need to cut down on postal service. It is all a matter of book-

keeping, but it would make the Post Office Department look much better and it would give a true picture of what the postal service is costing the Nation. We include, also, all the other services rendered that are not part of regular postal services.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Did the gentleman from Louisiana hear the presentation to the House by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member on this matter?

Mr. LARCADE. I heard the very able presentation by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. CANFIELD. Does not the gentleman think the Post Office Department can pull in its belt and economize to the extent of 1 percent of its over-all requests?

Mr. LARCADE. Regardless of whether it can or not, the Postmaster General has issued this directive effective on July 1, and the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations will be followed. On July 1 the mail deliveries in the United States will be curtailed. I agree that the matter could be probably adjusted.

Mr. CANFIELD. The matter could be studied more. Does the gentleman know that the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget recently held that the Post Office Department overestimated its requirements for the new fiscal year to the extent of \$42,000,000? Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LARCADE. There may be something to what the gentleman says, but the fact is that unless some action is taken by the House at this time it is certain the directive of the Postmaster General will be put into effect, because he claims he does not have sufficient funds to provide this service and unless the Congress appropriates the amount required, which is estimated at \$22,000,000, the service will be discontinued. As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department has been operating under a deficit for many years. If my amendment is adopted and if this \$22,000,000 can be saved, it will not be spent and the amount will not be lost, wasted, nor squandered.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am perfectly willing to see the handiwork of the committee thoroughly reappraised and studied, but I am not willing to succumb to the directive of the Postmaster General and vote for the gentleman's amendment. I do not believe the gentleman has gone into this thing thoroughly. He has taken the word of the Postmaster General that he has to have these funds immediately. The Postmaster General, I learned this afternoon, is to appear before our subcommittee on tomorrow or the next day regarding deficiencies for the first part of the year. He will be taken care of if he makes his case.

Mr. LARCADE. Will the gentleman agree to afford to the Post Office Department sufficient funds to reinstate this service if it is found that the appropriations made by the committee are not sufficient?

Mr. CANFIELD. The Post Office Department of the United States has never been let down by our subcommittee or the Congress of the United States. The committee has always provided that department with sufficient funds, but now we are trying to get the Post Office Department to pull in its belt just a little bit, 1 percent, and see if we cannot help effect some economies for the taxpayers of this country. One percent, that is.

Mr. LARCADE. I agree with that, but I think you are starting out in the wrong way.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is easy to get up here on the floor to pose an amendment appropriating extra millions, but it should not be done without a thorough study and knowledge of the facts.

Mr. LARCADE. Is the gentleman in favor of discontinuing this service even if the Post Office Department is provided additional money?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am not and I emphasized that in the committee, and that was one of the items that I tried to emphasize most this morning. I am in favor of appropriate deliveries for our people.

Mr. LARCADE. Does the gentleman believe that this matter can be adjusted before July 1 so that this service will not be discontinued?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe it will be done.

Mr. LARCADE. If I were certain of that, I would withdraw my amendment. I think the Members of the House should be given an opportunity to vote on this amendment, because I believe there is doubt in the minds of many whether or not that will be done. I heard considerable discussion on this matter this morning, and several of the Members of the House advised me that they were going to speak on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to add \$23,000,000 to this appropriation for the Post Office Department. The situation presently is that all through my territory they do not have any second delivery—in a great many districts throughout the country they do not have a second delivery—so that this so-called order of the Postmaster General has no effect on me. I do not believe in special privileges, or providing one thing for one part of the country and not for another. The need for economy at the present time is so great that we should not embark upon a \$23,000,000 additional program which is going to run to \$100,000,000 before we get through. An investigation of this item by the Post Office Department a couple of years ago resulted in a recommendation on their part that this service not be attempted.

I think this Congress must at this time assert itself and take some responsibility. We are going to be given the opportunity of voting for a tax-reduction bill on excise taxes. Frankly, I cannot conscientiously vote for that kind of bill and then vote for increased expenses in this instance. I do not believe any

needed services will be curtailed in the slightest degree if this money is not added. I think the committee has provided ample funds for the entire service.

The total amount of this amendment is something like \$23,000,000. The total amount here is \$1,786,000,000. That is \$92,000,000 above last year. I think the committee has been exceedingly generous with the Department for its postal operations. The cut is something like 1 1/3 percent on that particular item. It is not enough so that it should not in the slightest degree interfere with the services of the Department. You know that the gentleman from New Jersey told us, while the gentleman from Louisiana was in the well of the House, that the President had found they had allowed \$42,000,000 too much to take care of the regular operations of the Post Office Department. The over-all cut on the Post Office Department was only \$28,000,000 or two-thirds of what the President found was overestimated. I do not know that there is any justification for asking for this additional money. It does not seem to me that it makes sense to add this amount of money.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the amount of money allowed by the committee does not justify the cut which has been recommended by the Postmaster General so as to allow one service a day in residential areas?

Mr. TABER. It may reduce the service in some places, but I do not think the cut that has been made by the committee justifies any reduction in service. There is no cut in this appropriation which has any bearing on the cut in service that the Postmaster General has ordered to be put into effect immediately.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Furthermore the money that he is operating on now is the money contained in last year's budget and not this year's; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That is certainly correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But he is putting the cut into effect immediately.

Mr. TABER. Yes; he is putting the cut into effect immediately. I do not understand that there will be any very substantial cut in the number of employees.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman will recall that during the last session the Congress raised the pay of postal employees to the amount of \$130,000,000 for next year.

Mr. TABER. Yes; and the amount carried here is \$93,000,000 more than last year.

Mr. GARY. That was \$109,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Yes; \$109,000,000. So that practically all of it is here already.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I think our committee has been very generous to

the Post Office Department. I hope the Members will listen very carefully to these figures.

There was appropriated for the Post Office Department last year \$2,102,000,000. This year they requested \$2,235,000,000. The committee allowed the \$2,207,000,000, which was \$105,000,000 more than last year, and a cut of only \$28,000,000 of the amount requested, which is approximately 1 percent.

I think this cut of \$28,000,000 could be absorbed without reducing the service in the Post Office Department one iota. Yet, I do want to make it perfectly plain that I think the Postmaster General should be commended for curtailing the service to the extent that he has, rather than be condemned for his action.

The situation is that we now have an annual deficit in the Post Office Department of \$555,000,000. The total estimated budget deficit for this year has recently been raised to \$6,700,000,000. And for 1951 to \$7,300,000,000. I submit to this House that the time has come when we must eliminate all nonessential governmental services.

The order of the Postmaster General states that the proposed readjustments are calculated to meet the reasonable requirements of business and the reasonable requirements of our citizens for service to their homes. He instructs postmasters that in carrying out the order every effort should be made to maintain to the fullest extent possible the existing high-speed service in the handling of air mail, first-class mail, and daily newspapers, and to restrict the expenditures for the handling of low-revenue producing mails and service to daylight hours and to shorter periods. It is true that some residential sections now receiving two daily mail deliveries will be cut to one, but the vast majority of the residents throughout the United States have never received more than one daily mail delivery.

There is no reason why there should be any wholesale dismissals of postal employees by reason of these adjustments. The turn-over in personnel in the Post Office Department in 1948, by reason of deaths, resignations, and other causes, amounted to 34,563. This turn-over should be ample to absorb all employees made surplus by the order, merely by discontinuing the filling of vacancies.

Let us consider the city of Washington, D. C. There are 4,680 employees in the city postal service. In 1949 there was a turn-over of 625, which is 13.3 percent. It is estimated that 200 clerks and carriers will be affected by the order of the Postmaster General. Certainly in an annual turn-over of 625, these 200 employees can be easily absorbed. I checked on my own city of Richmond, this past week end when I was there, the Richmond postmaster advises me that although substantial savings will result in his office, he does not believe that it will be necessary to dismiss any regular employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 202. Appropriations made in this title for general administration and for postal operations shall be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee, or some member of the subcommittee, just the meaning or significance of this section 202.

Mr. GARY. The purpose of that section is to permit the members of our committee and the members of the budget and other authorized persons to go into the field and make inspections so that we can see that the money we are appropriating is being properly spent. Our own committee made two trips this year to inspect post-office operations, one to New York and one to Chicago. As a result of those inspections we have found some items in which we think substantial savings can be effected.

Mr. KEATING. Was a similar provision in last year's appropriation bill?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; it was.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman tell us how much was expended on that item?

Mr. GARY. I do not have the figures, but I know that members of our committee have taken two trips this year. This simply makes it possible for the members of our committee to make necessary investigation of the work of the Post Office Department. I can assure the gentleman that it is put in there not to spend money but to try to save money, because it is only by watching the expenditure of these funds that savings can be made. We went to Chicago to inspect a new distributing machine which, if put into operation in other offices throughout the country will probably save many thousands of dollars to the Department.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to hear the gentleman's statement that he believes the effect of this provision will be a net saving. I would certainly not want to interfere with any legitimate investigation designed to foster increased economy and efficiency in operations. Is a similar provision to be found in the chapters relating to the other departments? Or is such a provision to be found only in the chapter relating to the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. Similar provisions are in practically every chapter of the bill, and have been for years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Virginia if the expenditures for that purpose are charged to the Post Office Department deficit?

Mr. GARY. Yes; they are charged to the Post Office Department expenditures, and are reflected, of course, in the deficit. Since there is an annual deficit of \$555,000,000, every penny added to expenditures is reflected in the deficit.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have the figures on that item for either past years or projected years for any other Government department?

Mr. GARY. I have no figures on it at all.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly this matter of the cut in the postal service that we had in hand a moment ago. I think the Postmaster General might have helped the situation to some degree if he had given a little notice that he expected to curtail the delivery of mail as outlined in his order. I direct your attention to the fact that there are a number of places where savings could be made in the postal service. It is my view that the whole question of saving should be examined while the problem is at hand. Furthermore, if the Postmaster is making this move in order to save taxpayers money, he should say so. He should not use the excuse that there is a shortage of funds. I am informed the Post Office Department was allocated practically all funds requested from the Congress for this fiscal year.

This order, which was sprung upon the public totally without any preliminary preparation, has created a great deal of consternation among the users of the mails.

It has the appearance of turning back the clock from the standpoint of service and, if carried out, will disrupt delivery service in all first-class and most of the second-class post offices. The tone of the order, together with directions of the Deputy Postmaster General with respect to discharging of employees, has had a drastic effect on the morale of our postal workers. The Postmaster General has estimated approximately 10,000 employees will be released.

It is inconceivable that if reductions in force are carried on in a proper and orderly manner that this should necessarily affect any regular or substitute employees since there are many more than this number of temporary employees. Also, if the program were properly planned, normal attrition could be utilized for reduction-in-force procedures and no present postal employee needs to lose his job. This order, like so many others in the postal service, is made on a mass basis without preliminary experimental work. It is made before other economies with a lesser impact on the public or the postal employees have been instituted. These economies have been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General as a result of a study of the postal service made during the Eightieth Congress, also through the Hoover Commission and at appropriation hearings.

The postal deficit today is no greater than the postal deficit was last year and the prospects of its reduction are much brighter since the House has already passed a postal rate increase bill which, I am informed, under the last estimate of the Post Office Department and on current volume, will increase postal revenues by nearly \$150,000,000 a year.

In the Eightieth Congress, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee suggested that the elimination of the individual recording of special delivery mail be eliminated as a savings, which was

estimated at \$1,000,000 a year. This particular recommendation was taken up by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Department was requested to run a sample test in two cities. These sample tests worked out very well and then it was extended throughout the postal system. There was no disturbance to the public. Service was actually improved during the test period by the lessons that were learned. It would seem that this should have been the procedure followed if such a curtailment of service was to be ordered. In other words, we should know what the result would be from the standpoint of service to the public. The public should have been properly prepared for such a move and given an opportunity to express their views.

Another example of where economies might be placed in effect and service improved is in the adoption of mechanical sorting equipment in the larger post offices. The Postmaster General has stated this is a success with a machine at the Chicago post office which was rebuilt and improved after the recommendation was made by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the Eightieth Congress. Such machinery should be placed in other larger post offices to effect economies.

Public Law 231 Eighty-first Congress, established for the first time in the postal service a research and development program. In the establishment of such a program the Post Office Department, in its official reports, merely left this idea up to Congress without making any recommendations. However, now that the law has been enacted, they have listed a whole succession of developments which they expect to make and improve under this program.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 6395, which would place the accounting procedures of the Post Office Department on a businesslike basis.

This bill does not have the support of the Postmaster General, because in lieu of this bill, he prefers a measure that I believe will completely throw off any congressional control of expenditures of the Post Office Department. Furthermore, under what I regard the guise of Hoover Commission recommendations, the Department goes much further in recommending legislation than was ever intended by the Hoover Commission. I do not agree with the manner of the recommendations of the administration with respect to budgeting and accounting of the postal service. It would do the thing that has resulted here. It would fail to give the postal service a modern businesslike budgeting and accounting program.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], a valued and hardworking member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman also feel that the Postmaster General might have given more consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover report?

Mr. REES. I certainly do.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And does the gentleman feel that this in no way conforms to those recommendations?

Mr. REES. Those who propose this matter say that it does to some degree, but it is a small part of it. I think that the whole Hoover report on the Post Office Department should have been taken into consideration along with this proposal. That would have been fair to the people and fair to the Congress. The comparatively small reduction in this measure as against the request, I am advised, is less than 1 percent. And the reduction, mind you, is a recommendation of the majority of the membership of the Committee on Appropriations. I am also informed the Postmaster General did not heretofore make any complaint with respect to this reduction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, an active member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. On this question of the item for the Appropriations Committee traveling over the country to inspect post offices, does not the gentleman believe that the Committee on Appropriations ought to ask for an appropriation separate and apart from this in order that it should not be charged up to the deficit of the Post Office Department? We are talking about the postal deficit this afternoon.

Mr. REES. I am not so sure whether it should be in separate appropriation, but the expenses should be accounted for. I believe this committee will do that. One of the very important things is to see that modern machinery and up-to-date equipment is used where practical. More consideration should be given to suggestions from employees with respect to improvements in the service. Much time and expense could be saved. The Department has not been as active as it should be in this regard. Here is a place where real savings could be made.

Mr. GARY. May I say that our committee has been working specifically on that. I agree with the gentleman that millions of dollars can be saved by putting in modern machines and methods.

Mr. REES. And that recommendation was made by our committee long ago. I commend the gentleman for his efforts with respect to this matter.

Mr. GARY. It was made by our committee, too. We not only made the recommendation but we are following it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is one matter in connection with this whole subject under debate that disturbs me somewhat and we in due time are going to be called on to answer for it. It may be the wise thing, I do not know. I am not on this subcommittee, therefore I hesitate to even speak on it. But \$125,000,000 has been cut out of this bill. We are talking about a 1 percent cut. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars have been cut out of the bill on the basis that

a bill to raise postal rates which we passed in the House would bring in that much revenue.

That puts us in this position: We are sending a bill over to the Senate that has been cut 1 percent plus \$125,000,000. It puts the other body in the position of doing one or two things: First, it can restore this \$125,000,000; or second, it can pass the rate raise bill that will bring in the additional \$125,000,000 of revenue. Knowing the tendency of the other body in an election year, it will resort to the expediency of restoring this money rather than raising postage rates in an election year. So it puts us in the House in the position of having done what according to the Postmaster General amounts to a reduction in service by our action, and the other body restores it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that the cut in the bill of expenditures is only \$28,000,000. The House only appropriates the amount of money that is necessary to meet the deficit of the Post Office Department, the receipts of the Department being used to pay expenditures. The House merely appropriates for the deficit.

This body has already passed a bill increasing the receipts by \$125,000,000. What the committee did is to take that fact into account and simply provide that that \$125,000,000 which will be added to the receipts by the bill which we have passed will not be paid out of the Treasury. In other words, we do not want to give it to the Post Office Department twice. It is no cut in the expenditures and, obviously, if the Senate does not pass that bill, then it must raise the amount to be paid out of the Treasury by \$125,000,000.

Mr. PRESTON. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, there is no cut in the appropriation for activities. The only cut is in the estimate of what the committee believed the postal deficit will be.

Mr. GARY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. TABER. That is an automatic appropriation and is provided for under the postal laws. What the gentleman is talking about is the estimate of the committee of what the permanent appropriation is to be.

Mr. GARY. In making that estimate the committee had to take into consideration the bill that had been passed by the House; in other words, the action taken by the House.

Mr. PRESTON. It boils down to this, then: The Postmaster General says the Congress is at fault; the Congress says the Postmaster General is responsible for the reduction. Somewhere along the line the public is going to evaluate and determine responsibility. Whether there is a deficit or what we appropriate, it is still \$125,000,000. The other body is going to have the credit of having saved

the postal service and restoring this service to the people while we in the House of Representatives will get credit for having reduced the service.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Why has the Postmaster General sent out the order to the various post offices throughout the country curtailing the service to the people in the face of the fact that there is no cut by the Congress at this time until the Senate acts one way or the other on the bill that this House has already passed raising the revenue which will come to the Post Office Department?

Mr. PRESTON. The Postmaster General did what most any man would have done under the circumstances. Faced with a 1 percent plus \$125,000,000 reduction, he had to anticipate what shape he would be on July 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Mr. TACKETT. If the Senate did not pass that bill.

Mr. PRESTON. If the Senate did not pass that bill; yes. I think everyone in a Cabinet position has learned not to depend too strongly on what the Congress will act on.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman think this is a deliberate attempt to put us on the spot?

Mr. PRESTON. I am bringing it out so the public will be informed as to what has happened when they evaluate and place the responsibility.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I think the gentleman has stated the situation pretty well. It seems to me that we can assume here today that the \$125,000,000 will be available either through the passage of the rate increase bill or through a direct appropriation. May I ask the members of the subcommittee if that is a safe assumption?

Mr. TABER. No; that is not correct. All there is to this situation is that the committee in estimating what the permanent appropriations would be estimated \$125,000,000 less than the budget figured the deficit would be. The permanent appropriation is in such shape that whatever the deficit is will be taken out of the Treasury without any action by either this body or the other body. There is nothing in the bill that relates to that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$26,000,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses and the administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage Association; purchase (not to exceed 20 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service pro-

gram as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150): use of the services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchases of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the continental United States; the expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services; and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of a newspaper article appearing in the Washington Evening Star dated April 19, 1950, captioned "Senate probing RFC's rehiring of head of firm that got loan" and I quote the leading paragraphs of this newspaper account:

HAGERTY REGAINED JOB AFTER WALTHAM COMPANY SHUT-DOWN

A Senate investigating group wants to know more about the case of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation official who quit the agency to head the Waltham Watch Co., which owed it money, and then was rehired after the firm shut down.

RFC officials said yesterday that John J. Hagerty had returned to the Government lending agency as a special assistant to the board of directors. His salary is \$10,330 a year. This is approximately his former RFC salary. Waltham was reported paying him \$30,000.

Mr. Hagerty quit as head of the RFC's Boston agency early last year to become president of Waltham. A Senate banking subcommittee found that the employment shift was made after the agency had agreed to make a \$6,000,000 loan to Waltham on Mr. Hagerty's recommendation.

Chairman FULBRIGHT said today the subcommittee would be interested in hearing the agency's reasons for rehiring Mr. Hagerty.

"The rehiring of Mr. Hagerty calls to mind the fact that a bill passed last year by the Senate—and inspired to a great extent by the employment of Hagerty by the Waltham company—has not been passed by the House."

The bill Senator FULBRIGHT referred to, and which he sponsored in the Senate, would bar RFC employees from taking jobs with RFC borrowers for 2 years after a loan was granted. RFC has opposed the measure.

Waltham shut down February 3 when the RFC, after advancing \$4,000,000 of the \$6,000,000 credit, refused to release the other \$2,000,000 for use as working capital. RFC contended its loan terms authorized the \$2,000,000 for buying equipment, but not for working capital.

Now I wonder what the appropriate committee of the House, having jurisdiction, is doing with respect to this legislation.

I also hold in my hand a New York Times newspaper account in its issue of April 20, 1950, captioned "End of RFC Urged by Jesse Jones," and I am

going to quote a few leading paragraphs from this illuminating article:

FORMER HEAD OF CORPORATION IN LETTER TO FULBRIGHT CALLS MANY LOANS UNJUSTIFIED

WASHINGTON, APRIL 19.—Jesse Jones, who for years headed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, urged today that it receive "a decent burial, lock, stock, and barrel."

He said the conditions that prompted creation of the RFC back in depression days no longer existed and that continued activity in the field put the Government into competition with private lenders ready and able to handle all legitimate and justifiable loans.

SAYS MOTIVES HAVE CHANGED

Asserting that the RFC should have been put into liquidation at the end of the war, he declared it was "no credit to the Government" that this was not done "for the functions which have heretofore motivated the RFC do not appear to be those that now keep it in operation."

"Excuses are found to make loans, and in large amounts, that under no circumstances can be justified," he said. "The RFC should not be regarded as a source of easy money, a place where improvident loans may be made for personal or political reasons; a bank of issue for the socialization of the Nation's economy and a spigot where funds flow to those who are classed as acceptable risks because of political expediences."

He left no doubt about the type of loans he referred to in this broadside, asserting that the RFC was being "prostituted when making such loans as the Kaiser-Frazer, the Lustron, the Tex-Mass and the Waltham Watch Co."

"I mention these foregoing loans," he said, "because they are the ones that have been greatly publicized. I am not familiar with loans by the Corporation generally, but have no doubt that many of them will work out. I did notice in one of the Corporation's reports, probably at the end of the year, an item carried as 'Loans for consolidation of debt.'"

"That sounds very much like loans to pay creditors of the borrower which should not be a function of the Corporation and I am sure was never intended by the Congress."

Mr. Jones, a Director of RFC from 1932 to 1939 and its Chairman for the last eight of those years, stated his case for doing away with the Corporation in a letter to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Banking Subcommittee on the RFC. Mr. FULBRIGHT had solicited his views.

SADDENED BY MISUSE

Confessing he gave answer with mixed feelings about an organization for which he had developed great affection, Mr. Jones said he still took pride in the confidence which the Congress repeatedly placed in the Corporation while it was under my direction." He said he now was "saddened by the way it is being misused."

Founded as a weapon against the depression, the RFC could have been abandoned in the late thirties but for war clouds then gathering, Mr. Jones said. With its experienced personnel, he said it was natural to take over war work, in which it did a Herculean task.

He then proceeded to recite abuses that he said had grown up in the Corporation's operation.

"If the Congress is not willing to liquidate the Corporation," he said, "then I suggest that it close its 32 branches and only make loans to business and industry in cooperation with banks and other financial institutions which would make and administer the loans and carry a participation in them of not less than 25 percent for their own account."

Mr. Jones specifically recommended that the Corporation's participation in any loan

be limited to a few hundred thousand dollars.

URGES AN INVESTIGATION

"A thorough investigation of the Kaiser-Frazer loan, the Tex-Mass loan, the Waltham Watch loan, and the Lustron fiasco," he declared, "is clearly indicated, and this might be helpful to the committee in determining its recommendations for the future of the Corporation."

So long as the RFC remains in the lending business, Mr. Jones said, it would get applications for loans in spite of the belief he held that there was not "any lack of justifiable credit anywhere in the country."

"Some people would prefer to borrow from the RFC rather than from their local banks," he asserted. "Some may feel that they can go to their Congressman or their United States Senator or possibly to the White House and bring political pressure to bear on the Government-lending agent."

"The lending agent may feel that his job is a political one and that, to hold it, he must go along, or he might even feel that the judgment of men in high places in Government might be better than his, and accordingly approve a loan that should not be made without information on the subject, that must have been the situation with respect to the four loans mentioned."

Those are rather strong words from a former Chairman of the RFC. I wonder if it is not time for the appropriate committee of the House to take a little look-see into the operations of this Corporation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 115, line 16, strike out "\$26,000,000" and insert "\$24,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to reduce the item for administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment believing that some contractions in the activities of the RFC should be made. You have heard the gentleman from New Jersey tell us some things. We have heard about the Lustron matter which the House has so very clearly gone on record against. They built a lot of these metal houses which are not satisfactory and have not worked out. They could not sell them for anything like what they cost. It is about time we stopped putting a great deal of money up for things like that which ought not to come out of the Treasury. There was something, as I remember it, like \$100,000,000 in Lustron. For Kaiser-Frazer there was something like \$50,000,000, although I cannot remember the exact figure. This Waltham Watch business ran to something like \$7,000,000, and I do not know how much was involved in Tex-Mass, but I think it was several million dollars.

If they would concentrate their activities on really relieving distressed and legitimate going concerns and not get

mixed up in things of that kind and not spend the Federal Government's money for loans of that sort, they can get along with a great deal less money for their operating expenses. This will only reduce the amount to \$1,755,000,000 below last year's appropriations. I believe that can be done and that they can get along without any trouble at all. This is one of the places where a cut can be made which will be a constructive cut and which will result in less dangerous activities so far as the Federal Treasury is concerned. Perhaps it might result in a very large saving if we can confine the activities of that Corporation to things which need to be done instead of having them engage in these highly speculative matters which have not worked out at all.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman think if the amount allowed for administrative expenses were reduced it would result in some curtailment in the activities of the Corporation which would be all to the good by avoiding the situation where the Government goes into these ventures where the taxpayers lose a great deal more than even the \$2,000,000 that are involved in this amendment?

Mr. TABER. It would be notice to them that they must quit these speculative ventures where there is no substantial private investment or interest. If they would confine themselves to real legitimate needs of legitimate business which is putting in something and taking some risk itself, we would not have any such big loans, and we would not have things to explain to the people back home for their delinquencies.

Mr. KEATING. Such activity as the gentleman has described as "other legitimate activities," is what was intended when this Corporation was set up?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. KEATING. We never anticipated, in setting up the Corporation, that they would go into these give-away programs to concerns that are on the verge of or had gone over the edge into bankruptcy?

Mr. TABER. We never did.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is also an agency of Government that is quite touchy about being asked questions by committees of Congress.

Mr. TABER. It is, but they will have to get over that. We ought to save a couple of million dollars here and then they would probably save several million more.

Mr. GROSS. The taxpayers are getting touchy too, are they not?

Mr. TABER. They ought to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to reduce the item of \$26,000,000 down to \$24,000,000. This is a reduction of less than 10 percent. In fact, it is less than 8 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I think I realize that it is the sense of the majority of this membership not to support reductions in this appropriation bill, but I do think here is one place where reduction can be made without any injury to anybody. It is less than 10 percent reduction. This item of \$26,000,000 for administration expenses, which is for salaries and expenses incidental thereto, is \$225,000 more than this committee allocated for that purpose last year, so this is an increase over last year's appropriation, and the amendment would reduce your recommendation by less than 8 percent of last year's amount.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman know that the salary increases voted by the Congress last year amount to \$675,000, so that the committee has allowed them a great deal less than the total amount of the salary increases which this Congress has authorized and directed us to pay?

Mr. REES. I am quite familiar with that. Also, that quite a number of presidential appointees received a substantial amount of this increase. The increase to those in the lower brackets was quite moderate.

As I understand it, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created principally to take care of loans of worthy concerns that were in distress because of depression conditions. It rendered a great service in that respect. Since that time it has also gone into the business of competing, to some degree, with private enterprise. I think, in recent years, it has taken on some unnecessary risks. Some loans that good judgment would not approve. Some loans in the past couple of years that were quite a risk in venture capital.

May I ask the distinguished chairman of our great Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who made such a wonderful and effective plea a few days ago for saving money for the people of this country, and relieving them of a little of the responsibility of paying taxes, I am wondering if he does not think that here would be a good place to save \$2,000,000 without any injury at all. The management of the RFC certainly can curtail their expenses to the extent of less than 10 percent. They can trim their personnel and expenses and absorb a little of this reduction. Now, the gentleman is a hard-headed, careful businessman himself. I know he believes in saving every penny and every dollar that he can. I wonder if he would not go along and help us save \$2,000,000. I know the country will appreciate it. I know the people will applaud him if he will go along with us on this particular item. What is the gentleman's advice on that subject?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman's associates on the minority had made that proposition in the subcommittee, I would have supported it. Every proposition made by any member of the minority to cut appropriations, with the one exception noted yesterday, when the bill was under consideration in the subcommit-

tee, I supported. Then and there was the time to make the cut if the minority really wanted to cut. Of course, today, here on the floor, when the proposal is obviously political, we have another situation. In the subcommittee, when the bill was being written, the gentleman's party opposed these cuts.

Mr. REES. Well, here is a wonderful opportunity to support the ranking minority member of his committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, to me that is a declaration that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. REES. I do, too. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that if he will lead the way we will save \$2,000,000 before we are through this afternoon. It will be most effective if the gentleman will support this proposal. It will save \$2,000,000 without injuring anybody. It will have a helpful and salutary effect upon the House and upon the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would not be misunderstood. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, since its inception back in the twenties, has rendered a great service to the business interests and to the people of this country. Only on few occasions have I criticized the activities of this organization. I am informed that at present the balance sheet would show a profit. We hope it may show as well in a couple of years.

The thing we are discussing is whether the RFC will curtail its administrative expenses by less than 8 percent over last year. This would be in line with the policy laid down by this committee a couple of years ago when agencies were requested to absorb certain requested administrative expenses. Furthermore this agency, I am informed, is not supposed to expand its activities during the next fiscal year, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is recognized for 5 minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of the committee, has stated something about some Hagerty transactions of this Corporation. Frankly, I am not familiar with the Hagerty matter. I understand that it is under investigation at the present time by a Senate committee. If there is anything wrong, I hope it will be discovered and that the guilty will be properly punished. I wish, however, to call attention to the fact that one of the first presidents of RFC was Mr. Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago, and shortly after he left the organization the corporation lent to his bank in Chicago millions of dollars. I do not say that there was anything wrong in that transaction, but there was considerable criticism at the time, and I simply want to keep the record straight as to past transactions.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this item is not an appropriation. It is merely an authorization for the RFC to use a portion of its receipts for operating expenses. The Corporation is making money—not a penny of the amount in question is paid out of the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the Corporation actually earned last year \$3,100,000. It is

estimated that in 1950 it will earn \$27,300,000; and it is estimated that in 1951 it will earn \$39,100,000.

You will not cut one penny from the amount appropriated in this bill by adopting this amendment. Although, under the law, the Congress must authorize the expenditures of the Corporation, it does not appropriate funds for those expenditures out of the Treasury. We authorized for fiscal year 1950 the expenditure of \$25,775,000. They requested \$27,100,000 for 1951; we allowed \$26,000,000. In other words, we cut the request \$1,100,000. It is true this is \$225,000 more than they spent last year, but the salary increases voted by the Congress last year for employees of the Corporation were \$625,000.

Just one thing more. I have heard a lot of talk in this body about the desire to aid small business. This is the Corporation that is aiding small business; and the reason for these additional expenditures which they have requested is largely because of the small-business loans they are making at the present time in an effort to strengthen our economic condition. If we cut this Corporation's authorizations too drastically, we inevitably will affect its ability to help the small-business corporations of the country.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question or two?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman does not maintain that the Kaiser Co. and the Lustron Co. are small business, does he?

Mr. GARY. I would guess that they are not much larger than the Charles G. Dawes bank in Chicago; but I would say to the gentleman that the Kaiser loan is but one loan made by the Corporation and that loan has been carefully investigated. This Corporation has a very substantial reserve set aside for losses and it has had a very satisfactory loan experience; it has lost very little because of bad loans.

Mr. REES. I am just talking about the difference between small and large concerns.

Mr. GARY. They do make some large loans.

Mr. REES. That is what I mean.

Mr. GARY. Yes; they do make some large loans, but a great majority of their loans are small ones, because most of the big companies can go to the banks and borrow money, whereas many small-business men cannot; so most of the loans of this Corporation are for small business.

Mr. REES. The gentleman will agree that this \$2,000,000 reduction we are talking about would to that degree reduce the cost to the Treasury and largely go back to the Treasury.

Mr. GARY. It is not paid out of the Treasury; none of the receipts of this Corporation—

Mr. REES. But it will reduce expenses that much.

Mr. GARY. Any savings would go into the reserves or other assets of the Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 54, noes 63.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take some time on the amendment upon which we just voted, but I felt it was futile to make any effort. I am a little discouraged with the fact that members of the subcommittee too often feel when they bring in a bill it cannot be cut. I undertake to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most important things this Congress can do is to reduce these several items where they will stand a reduction. The people throughout the Nation are demanding we reduce the cost of Government.

It is my judgment that had we reduced the RFC \$2,000,000 it might have served as a warning for those in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to go a little slower in making marginal and reckless loans for which this organization was never intended.

There are men in this Congress who made their money before they came here, and men all over this Nation who have money to invest who cannot find investment. The banks are bulging with 43-cent dollars throughout this Nation, whose officers would like to loan their money in such a way that it would provide revenue that would come into the Treasury of the United States in the over-all business. But they are not permitted to do so under the free-enterprise system that made this country great, because of the easy-money pattern set by the Government. This organization has got down to the point where they make risk-capital loans, that the RFC know never should be made; they should not make, such as the Lustron Corp. loan, phony loans of that kind, which caused the Government to lose \$37,500,000 on this one operation, and possibly various other loans like that; for instance, the Kaiser loan, going into competition with legitimate organizations that have served this country for years under our competitive system, is another example.

We should have, in my judgment, reduced their appropriations, which would have caused them to stop, look, and listen. As was said, when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was brought into being, it was for the purpose of making distress loans.

Reference has been made to the loan to the Dawes bank in Chicago. I think it was something like \$87,000,000. They say, "Well, that loan was made." Yes, that loan was made, and that loan of something like \$87,000,000 was a distress loan that prevented hundreds and hundreds of correspondent banks dependent upon the Dawes bank from going broke throughout the Mississippi Valley during the run on the banks. That loan was paid back with interest, and that was

the purpose of setting up in the first place the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which has been prostrated into the position now of investing Government capital as risk capital on loans that are causing a loss, on loans that are in competition with private industry.

I am sorry that it was seen fit to vote this amendment down, and I hope when other amendments are offered to reduce items in this bill at various places, as they will be offered in the future, that some of you Members of the administration will recant a little and give us an opportunity to reduce where reductions are justified.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman if, as a matter of fact, the reason the Dawes loan was paid back was not the fact that the Democrats brought prosperity to the country?

Mr. VURSELL. No, it was not the fact that the Democrats brought prosperity to the country, but it was because of the great ability of the former Vice President of the United States, the man who introduced the budget system in order to control Government expenses, and because of the confidence the people had in him as one of the outstanding financiers of the midwestern part of this Nation, that he was able to operate his bank successfully and pay back every dollar with interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my taking these few minutes is to extend my congratulations to a very efficient Member of this House. I have reference to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] the majority whip. I have been very much interested in seeing the gentleman operate on the numerous teller votes. I think he is doing a good job for his side of the House, and that job is to bring in through the tellers just sufficient Democrats to barely override time after time the efforts of the Republicans who are trying to achieve a little economy in this House. I think that the gentleman from Tennessee is doing a good job for his party. That is his responsibility. I think he is efficient, but it does seem strange to me that I have not as yet seen more than three Members of the Democratic side at any one time during this past week going through the tellers on any amendment that called for a reduction. I want that in the Record. I think the people of the Nation are entitled to know the facts.

If I am wrong in this assertion that not over three Democrats have gone through the tellers on any one vote calling for reductions in appropriations, I will be glad to be corrected. Personally, I repeat, I have not observed any support given to the Republican economy amendments, other than from three Members of the controlling party, in any one instance.

I wonder if you Democrats view your duty as being first to the people of the Nation or is it absolutely essential for you to follow your whip, Mr. PRIEST, who after all is doing a splendid job of backing up the administration in this House. I leave that thought to your conscience. Also, cannot loyalty to one's party blind a person perhaps to the huge deficit faced by our Nation this year and next?

The Clerk read as follows:

This chapter may be cited as the "Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1951."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the last paragraph of chapter IV? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

General debate will now be had on chapter V, the same to be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

H. R. 3960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill H. R. 3960 which I introduced and which is a private bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING DURING THIS WEEK

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow; that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday; that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

CONGRESS SALUTES ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to take this time to extend our heartfelt felicitations to the State of Israel, its officials, and its people, who are devoting this week to marking the second anniversary of the independence of this new republic.

Israel's celebration of the second anniversary of its independence is cause for rejoicing by all civilization. It signifies the realization of age-old dreams and hopes. Its very existence indicates that the Jews are no longer a homeless and aimless people. That they now have a haven for the homeless and the persecuted, to which they have been streaming in the hundreds of thousands in the last 2 years.

It was not easy for the people of Israel to reestablish their homeland. We all know the record of blood and tears, of toil and sorrow, before and since independence was attained. Even now, as we celebrate its second anniversary, we are told that their Arab neighbors are building up their armed strength as part of a plan for a renewal of their efforts to crush the new state and all that it stands for.

We have been getting reports from Cairo where the Arab League recently held an important conference. The major topic of discussion was Israel—not plans to reach lasting peace with Israel and throughout the Middle East, but plans to crush Israel economically, to isolate it as much as possible and to force Egypt and Jordan to break off peace negotiations with Israel.

Several days ago there was a debate in the British House of Commons on the question of British arms shipments to the Arab countries, while at the same time Britain maintains an embargo on the sale of arms to Israel. Members of parliament, of all parties, urged the government to stop sending arms to the Arab states because of the threats of a renewal of warfare against Israel or, in the alternative, lift its one-sided embargo and allow Israel to purchase arms in England. In reply to these requests, the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Ernest Davies, pretended that—

The position is not quite the same as regards Israel and we have treaty obligations toward Egypt, Iraq and Jordan.

Under the pretext of treaty obligations Britain maintains she must ship arms to the Arab states, while refusing to enter into negotiations with Israel to help her defend herself. At the same time we learn that—

The Tel Aviv government has been told by London authorities that if it will reach full settlement with the Arab states it can also receive military supplies from Britain.

It is very queer that no such conditions have been imposed on the Arab countries. They are not required to enter into peace settlements with Israel before Britain assumes treaty obligations to supply them with arms. But Israel, which wants peace and needs peace in order to be able to devote its full attention and resources to integrate the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have come into the country in the last 2 years, is told to reach a settlement with the Arab states who have not shown the least inclination to enter into such negotiations.

This is a most vicious circle, a buck-passing merry-go-round, for which Britain is solely to blame. All this means keeping the Middle East in constant tur-

moil and that, mind you, at a time when it is so imperative for the United States to have tranquillity and peaceful cooperation in this important area of the world. Is this to be regarded as Anglo-American cooperation and coordination of mutual interests? Or are we to regard it as the same old double talk that we always get from those stupidly selfish British, few but powerful, who refuse to face the truth.

It is gratefully remembered by the people of Israel and by Jews in this country and all over the world that the United States was the first nation to grant recognition to Israel. This fact will go down in Jewish history in bold—yes, in gold letters. To date, a total of 59 nations have granted recognition to the State of Israel, including three Moslem countries: Turkey, Iran, and Indonesia.

It is, likewise, gratefully remembered that the United States granted material aid to Israel in many ways, and more particularly by a \$100,000,000 loan. All of this tremendously helped the infant Jewish state in its efforts to build up its economy and to utilize its resources to the full.

In the midst of our great jubilation, as Israel enters its third year of independence, our hearts and minds are filled with prayer that its people and all the world may soon know true peace. I further hope and trust that our own country, these great United States of America, will not only continue its policy of close friendship with Israel, but that it will take the necessary precautionary steps to assure Israel's continued existence as a free state. We must make crystal clear to all would-be aggressors in the Middle East that this country will not tolerate any aggression against the only state in the Middle East built on true democratic principles—the State of Israel.

By example, as well as by precept, that state is teaching that part of the world how to live as brothers. God gave us the privilege of holding high the torch of liberty in order to enlighten the world. To continue to earn the blessings of the Father of all mankind, we must keep burning the flame of freedom which we helped to light in the Near East.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks to appear at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Israel is 2 years old today, a young nation in years but one which is adult in every other respect. In a period of weak and vacillating governments, she has established a stable regime that speaks and acts with authority because it truly represents its citizenry. She has been received as an adult nation in the councils of the United Nations.

Sprung phoenix-like from the pyre of 6,000,000 Jews recently massacred in Eu-

rope, Israel is building in a world of destruction. From the rocky, shrub-coated hills of Galilee, along the Lebanese and Syrian frontiers, through the Jordan Valley, down the Plain of Sharon and southward into the Negeb Desert, robust new communities are mushrooming. Over a barren land, sand dunes are being covered with the blossoms of fruit trees; malarial swamps are becoming pleasant dairy farms. Israel is not only making a home for those who have survived the horrors of concentration camps; she is raising the economic and social status of peoples who have come in great numbers from the Orient and Africa—and that of her native Arab population.

With a land that was said to be already overpopulated—a land without the unlimited natural resources of young America—but with the faith that man with God can do the impossible, she has opened her gates to unlimited immigration. She has had the courage of liberty, saying in the words emblazoned upon our own Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free. Send them, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp.

Mr. Speaker, this bright new nation is entitled to her opportunity to live. Although born in combat and emerging victorious from a war in which it overcame overwhelming odds, Israel has no desire to continue as a warrior nation. It wants to live in peace so that it may develop its resources for the benefit of its people and the world. It cannot do so because of the threat of the recurrence of hostilities with the Arab nations whom she defeated and who are rearming, with the sustaining flow of war matériel from England. As long as that flow of arms is continued, peace in the Middle East will be a mirage. The Dove of Peace cannot alight in the midst of beating war drums. We must help still those drums.

As our Nation has displayed to the world the dynamism of growth, Israel is also proving the efficacy of determination and a dream. She is a bridgehead of democracy in the east. She is bringing a constructive, enlightened democracy to a vast area where age-old tyranny still reigns. We honor her, not just today, but for all time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my friend from New York in the very sound and able remarks that he has made on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that "life is not time; life is content; time is merely a vessel in which one deposits the jewels of one's achievements."

Measured by this concept, the 2 years of the existence of the free, sovereign, and democratic state of Israel constitute what historians call an epoch in the an-

nals of the struggle of peoples for self expression and for the achievement of a status of equality and dignity in the family of nations.

This second anniversary of the proclamation of Israel's independence and the manner by which Israel's freedom has been obtained, serve as an inspiration and encouragement to all other peoples in every corner of the earth who are longing for national self fulfillment and for the achievement of complete national integrity.

In the light of this miraculous national rebirth of Israel, we need not despair of civilization and progress in spite of the terrific strain and manifold afflictions with which mankind is beset today.

Here we see a people who have been forcefully driven out from their homeland and for centuries were scattered and spread throughout the world, exposed to cruel oppressions of all kinds and humiliating persecution. Probably the climax of that terrible fate was reached in the crematoria and gas chambers of Hitler's Germany, where 6,000,000 Jews—men, women, and children, and infants even on their mothers' breasts—were exterminated. And yet, the power of faith has always proved itself to be all conquering. The miracle of recreation came to pass before our very eyes. The remnant of Israel is marching home to resume life in their national homeland, which was destroyed by Titus.

As Americans we may point with pride to the fact that, in the enactment of the epic of Israel reborn, our own country, in no small measure, contributed toward the hastening of this day of fulfillment.

The Republic of Israel naturally could not escape the ailments of infancy. However, it is gradually and, we hope, successfully overcoming them.

Indeed, Israel's achievements of organized, orderly statehood, in so brief a time, are as heroic as its military victories.

These accomplishments are the more remarkable when one recalls the confused conditions and disruptions of civil life which prevailed in Palestine after the exit of the British administration.

A new world was created by Israel out of chaos. I am persuaded that Israel's problems of today, both internal and external, will eventually be successfully solved in a spirit of amity and mutuality.

Israel needs peace even as one needs the oxygen of the air. Israel needs the good will of mankind. I am confident that Israel will do everything to deserve the continuous respect of the democratic nations of the world and make itself worthy of the confidence of mankind.

The social and economic problems of the nations of the Near East are overwhelming. There is need for the improvement of the lot of the common man in the Arab countries in order to enable him to live under elementary decent conditions of life to which a human being is entitled. The Arab countries and Israel can, therefore, ill afford to use their economic resources for the unproductive pursuit of an armament race, which should be used for the improvement of the standard of life.

The recent action of the Council of the Arab League in Cairo, Egypt, in coercing Transjordan to suspend its peace negotiations with Israel, is regrettable.

Intransigence against peace is never a virtue.

Our own Government, like Israel, is deeply concerned in the establishment of enduring peace between Israel and the Arab Nations, and the development of normal human relationships among all the countries in the Near East, including Israel.

I confidently look forward to the creation of new human values in Israel as well as among the Arab Nations. Mankind will be grateful for a new and inspiring message as a guide to a perplexed world.

These are my thoughts on this day when the second anniversary of Israel's independence is being celebrated, accompanied by my heartfelt felicitations and best wishes for prosperity, tranquility, and peace—the watchword of God.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am happy to join the gentleman from New York in this birthday celebration of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed, who love liberty, have cause to rejoice together today. For this is the day of the rebirth of Israel's independence. Two years ago a new light of democracy was kindled in the east on the day of Israel's proclamation of independence. The third Jewish Commonwealth has appeared on the arena of history as a concrete, potent, and living force, on the foundation of the ideals of liberty, equality, and justice—ideals so dearly cherished by us as Americans.

This event commands and should command the respectful attention of history.

It is inspiring to behold a people, separated from their homeland and fighting for 1,900 years for survival, find itself again in the land of its forefathers, as a free and sovereign people.

We recall with admiration the early days of Israel's struggle when it was faced with overwhelming forces of the armies of five Arab nations in a frantic attempt to crush Israel's life at its birth. Israel is a free nation today because of the determination and the sacrificial valor of its youth who shed their blood on the field of battle in defense of freedom. This was one of history's finest demonstrations of vigor, courage, and lofty idealism.

In this human drama of the rebirth of Israel, the United States was not a passive spectator.

I think it is not inappropriate on this occasion, to call attention to the fact that it was the United States Congress in 1922 which gave its official approval to the aims and aspirations of Zionism through what was known then as the Palestine resolution, which was sponsored by Republican leadership. The official sanction by the United States Congress by a joint resolution, was the first act of any legislative body of the world to endorse and acknowledge the rights of the Jewish people to establish

their national home in Palestine. This was the foundation of our American policy which manifested itself in manifold benevolent ways, contributing much to the realization of the Jewish dream to reestablish their nation in the land of their ancestors.

I like to believe that this bond of friendship between Israel and the United States will continue and progressively grow stronger.

I am aware of the terrific struggle in which Israel is engaged today—the struggle of receiving and absorbing the hundreds and thousands of Jews who come to Israel in search for peace and security. I trust a way will be found to alleviate the existing restlessness in Israel because of the shipment of arms, particularly by Great Britain, to the Arab States. We must help to create conditions in the Near East which will eliminate the present tension between Israel and the Arab States and, above all, stop the armament race between Israel and its neighbors, which is the consequence of the lifting of the embargo for delivery of arms to the Arab nations and at the same time denying it to Israel. Indeed, the remnant of the Nazi victims who found refuge in Israel should not again be exposed even remotely to the possibility of a new slaughter.

As Americans, we extend our best wishes to one of the youngest of states and pray that permanent peace be speedily established between Israel and the Arab states so that they may live together as good neighbors, in harmony and freedom.

It is in this spirit of faith in the future of this new nation that I salute the Republic of Israel.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to associate myself with the distinguished minority leader and the other members who are today expressing their felicitations to the courageous State of Israel over the celebration of the second year of its independence.

The struggles, privations, and sufferings which marked the establishment of their birthright by the Zionist patriots find a parallel in those attending the beginnings of our own great Nation. Militarily, the brave Israelis met with outstanding successes, although often hampered by the policies of those governments at whose side they had only recently fought for democracy and freedom against the forces of evil aggression.

On this second anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, we naturally think especially of the brave men and women who fell in their courageous effort to establish a homeland for the homeless. They can most appropriately be honored by the assurance that their heroic sacrifice has not been in vain.

Therefore, on this auspicious day, we should not only rejoice and give thanks for the accomplishments to date, but also highly resolve that every legitimate step will be undertaken to insure the continued progress and growth in strength and stability of this newest member of the family of nations.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has asked for this time in order that we may be afforded an opportunity to speak on this momentous occasion. In a world beset by confusion, doubt, and fear, it is a refreshing change to contemplate the hopeful signs about us.

On the world stage, the observance of Israel's second birthday as a free and independent state is clearly one of the most promising developments.

At a time when older nations, with more experience and resources, have slept on their liberties and so have lost them, the brave and successful example of tiny Israel is a reproof and a challenge.

No people in all history have suffered so much and so long for the opportunity to be free. Because of this and the great spiritual strength which sustained them, the Jewish people fought for liberty instead of retreating from it.

They did not ask for guaranties of material security at the cost of self-respect and self-reliance.

They asked only for a restitution in part of the ancient homeland that was stolen from them so many centuries ago and from which they were evicted so heartlessly to become wanderers on the face of the earth.

A few did cling to the fair country in which they had imperishable roots. They endured every persecution as they watched successive conquerors despoil their native land and reduce it to a barren waste.

These few were the nucleus for the rebirth of Israel.

At last the troubled conscience of mankind began to listen to the moral fervor of their pleas, spoken with the ringing call for justice like the prophets of old. A slight concession was made, permitting a pathetically small number of Jews to return to Palestine. It was so little and almost too late. The persecution of the Jewish people reached a climax of agony during and after World War II. Even so-called civilized nations would not give them sanctuary. And so, on foot, and in frail boats, while many died of fatigue and hunger on the way, they struggled back to the homeland only to find the gates closed to them by strange faces who did not belong there.

Neither imperialism nor the designs of the pan-Arabic world could resist the pressure of such tragedy.

There was nothing more that the Jews could lose but life itself and so those in Palestine fought for their independence and for the opening of the gates to their brethren who desperately wanted the shelter of home.

It seemed such a hopeless fight against the power and duplicity of British imperialism and the intrigues of the Arab states surrounding little Palestine.

But they fought with a faith and the courage born of right which those with greater numbers and more material weight could not bring to this task.

Only the American Revolution and the later struggle of the Irish people to win

their independence, can be compared with the valiant effort of the Jewish people in freedom's name.

Two years ago yesterday they won, and the new State of Israel was born.

We in the United States were happy, not only because we believed in and supported the claims of the Jewish people, but because we welcomed a new addition to the family of free nations.

In two short years, Israel has made tremendous progress, more than some of its larger neighbors have made in centuries. A new nation that stirs with the enterprise that only freedom can inspire. The genius of the Jewish people is coming to full flower again because they have won the opportunity to demonstrate their talents. Tel Aviv is perhaps the most modern city in this world. Industry, trade, ocean-going commerce and agriculture are booming with pioneer spirit and energy.

Two out of every five Jews in Palestine today have arrived since the declaration of independence.

They are building from the rocky ground up, and with the loving labor of muscle and mind they are reclaiming the deserts and transforming them into gardens of beauty and bountiful harvest.

With the reverence for culture which is their outstanding characteristic, they have already established a foundation of compulsory education for every child. It is one that will enrich each individual with the broad horizons of knowledge and develop the mature and responsible citizenship that will guarantee a great future for this heroic people.

The confidence of American investors in the ability of Israel to establish a sound and progressive society is proof of our faith in the new nation.

For too long, that area which is the birthplace of religion and civilization has been in the hands of those who took without giving in return.

But the Middle East is awakening, led by the bright young star of Israel. It could resolve the difference between man's spiritual ideals and his failure to translate them into everyday application.

From this cradle of life on earth, I have high hopes that the young democracy of Israel will help us to reconstitute a world where men may live again as brothers, obedient to the will of our Creator.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I wish to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] in congratulating the State of Israel on this its splendid second anniversary, and I express the sincere hope that it may continue long as a nation and set a splendid governmental pattern for all other nations to follow in the future—the long years to come.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly privileged to join with the gentleman from New York in extending congratulations and best wishes to the State

of Israel upon the second anniversary of its national independence.

Friends of Israel may look with genuine pride upon the constructive achievements which have been recorded since the inception of this new and brilliant star in the firmament of free nations.

On the glorious day so fittingly set aside to celebrate the second year of its independence, I am pleased and honored to send my heartiest greetings and congratulations to those who sacrificed so much to insure the reality of a free Israel.

While we rejoice in the progress achieved thus far, we must be inspired to a constant vigilance and dynamic action, where necessary, to preserve the integrity and security of the new state which is still challenged by hostile forces.

The American Nation, mindful of its own heritage of freedom, will continue to manifest deep interest and wholehearted cooperation in protecting Israel against aggression, infiltration, and interference with its precious right of self-determination. That must be our unflinching purpose at this critical time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations on the second anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel to the Jewish people, who by sheer courage and determination have taken their place among the nations of the world.

In the struggle for independence and freedom the State of Israel has demonstrated that the will and determination of a people to be free of oppression can be realized, regardless of the difficulties which have to be overcome.

My sympathetic efforts to help in the establishment of the State of Israel have been freely given both in my position as an official of Los Angeles County and as a Member of Congress from California. It is my hope that the State of Israel will continue to prosper and grow in importance among the other nations of the world.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and all the other Members who have spoken and those who will speak hereafter, on the splendid remarks that have been made and will be made. It seems to me that this is a demonstration on the part of the membership of the House of real, heartfelt congratulations to the State of Israel. I am sure each and every one wishes for it the high place in world affairs which it deserves. Even though it is small in its population, I know it will be a shining example of real democracy to the rest of the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the adjournment of this House for the Christmas recess in 1946, I had the pleasure of seeing a resolution that was introduced in this House by me passed by the House, calling upon the Congress to express its belief and hope that there would be a free civilian republic established in Israel. That was done, and I am pleased that by so doing and by my speaking today and by the words of my colleagues who are here today we give evidence to the world and to our brothers that this is not entirely a Jewish problem; the establishment of a free and sovereign state in Israel was a Christian problem as well and continues to be so. I am pleased that the United States of America on this, Israel's second birthday, extends again hands across the sea to this brave and courageous people in their brave and independent republic.

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO].

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from New York and the other Members of this House in extending felicitations to the new Republic of Israel. Certainly this new Republic that is celebrating its second anniversary should be extended every encouragement that we possibly can, especially when we consider that this new nation is the outpost of democracy in this part of the world.

This great country of ours that is contributing assistance to some of the nations of Europe to maintain democracy there certainly ought to lend every effort to maintain and help this nation take its place amongst the family of nations throughout the world, and I am happy to join my colleague from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. We friends of the State of Israel in the United States Congress wish to congratulate the state upon its second anniversary and wish it every success in the future. The people of the United States want to progress with the State of Israel shoulder to shoulder in the years to come.

I want to join with the gentleman from New York in his views, and to congratulate him on his remarks of encouragement to this fine young Republic.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, salute the gentleman from New York on leading the House in this observance today. I was the first American Congressman to trod the sodden paths of Buchenwald in April 1945. When I returned I wrote the President of the United States stressing the urgency of the Palestine movement. I am pleased now to be able to join in the celebration of Israel's second birthday. A brave and long-suffering people have written history in Israel, and they appreciate the inspiration and encouragement accorded by the United States of America. We should continue to lend them this inspiration and encouragement.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I was thrilled as I stood in this Chamber and paid tribute on the first anniversary of the founding of a new nation, a new nation that had conceived itself and dedicated itself to the principle of justice to all of its people, a nation that was young and yet was strong; a nation that recognized that it had its difficulties ahead, and yet it took into consideration not only the money consideration that every new nation must recognize when it opens its arms to the people of that race. Just like my own race, they had been persecuted down through the years.

Last year as we were in Europe we saw the aged Jewish people who recognized that their day of life was about ended, yet they wanted to live up to the Biblical injunction to return to the Promised Land and there to pass their declining days.

I was so impressed by the action of the government of Tel Aviv as they opened wide their arms to those people whom they knew could be of no benefit materially to their nation, yet they recognized the strong spiritual urge that prompted them to come again to that land. So today as we stand again and speak out in praise for the government of Tel Aviv, while we have hopes of that nation's becoming stronger, we must recognize that it faces a very serious problem, that of its national economy. Israel will keep on, but it may be necessary for them to receive help. I know that government will always find help here in America, for in this Congress are many men of heart and courage who will offer assistance to them. Israel will continue to become stronger, to become greater among the nations of the world, another nation in another part of the world added to the United Nations, without partition, and that the two of them will go forward a victorious, a grand and glorious nation just as has our beloved America.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic occasion. It is a great thing we are doing here, it seems to me, when we extend felicitations to the newest democracy in the world. We all know how the people of this country and the Members of this body feel about this great country over there. Certainly many other Members who for one reason or another could not be here feel the same way.

Does not the gentleman from New York agree with me that there might be a better way for us to show how we feel about this democracy in the Middle East, which I have predicted, and will again, will some day be the greatest democracy in that part of the world. Would it not be more fitting if it were possible for this Government and for us as representatives here to to something more substantial than simply extend Israel felicitations? I mean by that, to

do something about stopping the flow of arms to the Arabs which will have one effect only. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman agrees with me. The effect will be to start what they call a second round in the Middle East. It will encourage the Arabs to think that possibly some countries, specifically and I refer now to Great Britain, and we in this country have some small part also in that, in the flow of arms to the Arabs must have the effect of starting another war. I wonder if it would be possible to bring some pressure—I do not like that word particularly—do something so that we can get our State Department to stop the flow of arms which is going from this country, and there is no question about that. It has never been denied. The statement is made that Great Britain is fulfilling its treaty agreements with the Arab states by sending them these arms. They have said very often that the only purpose of sending these arms is to maintain internal security. That is ridiculous when you note the type of arms that are being sent, such as jet planes, cannon, and all the implements of war. Yet the Labor Government of Great Britain has the gall to say they are sending these arms over to maintain internal security.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the action we are taking here today may culminate in some other form of concerted effort so that we may stop this flow of arms and permit the State of Israel to grow as it should. What we are doing in permitting this flow of arms is simply to make the Israelian Government use money for arms which it could use for more useful purposes. It has to defend itself. If we stop the flow of arms to the Arabs we would let these people use that money for other economic purposes, permit themselves to build up their state so that it would be able to take its place among the nations of the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the same point the distinguished gentleman from New York who just left the floor referred to I hear lately it is being suggested that the reason given by the British Empire for the sale and transportation of arms to the Arab nations is because the Arab nations have pledged their allegiance in case of hostilities with Russia, and that Israel merely says it will be neutral. May I say to the gentleman, may I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly prefer any place any time anywhere, even neutral Israel, to a militant protestation of alliance by any or all of the Arab nations. If there must be a sale and transmission of arms to the Arab nations then under the circumstances the same rights and the same equal privilege of the transportation of arms should be given to Israel.

Israel is a free and independent, peace-loving nation, it has no aggressive instincts or desires against its neighbors. We do not feel that the same circumstance is true of the neighboring and allied Arabs.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for their comments. Both are right as far as they go. I can assure the gentlemen that this expression of good will unanimously offered here on the floor today is an indication that we here are alive to these very vital issues and will do all within our power to see that there will not be any new outbreak of hostilities in the Near East. We can rely on Israel to carry on no acts of aggression and we hope that Britain is right in its statement that it is supplying arms to the Arabs only for the purpose of withstanding Soviet aggression.

I have my doubts as to what the Arabs intend to do with those arms, but I express the hope that the Arabs will carry out the British hope that they will only be used against aggression by Soviet Russia.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I think it most appropriate that we as a freedom-loving legislative body pause here today to extend our congratulations to the leaders and the people of Israel, on the occasion of the second anniversary of their independence.

We all recognize that these 2 years have been a period, not only of great achievement but of real suffering and sacrifice for the citizens of this new state.

Truly Israel's independence was only acquired through a demonstration of the people's ability to undergo trial by fire. The recordings of modern history will, I know, extend full credit for creating the free State of Israel to the brave men and women who accepted fierce battle as the only means of gaining a rightful sovereign status. In meeting the challenge of their personal history this one small nation has given active expression to the conscience of all peoples of the world.

Having survived the battle, having reached independence, having provided haven for 400,000 souls in 2 years, Israel is, and will be, confronted with many more trials. However, one cannot believe for a moment that a country which could so quickly forge a victorious army, which could so rapidly take its place on the international diplomatic and political scene will fail to successfully overcome new challenges as they occur. In the months to come the statesmanship and the vision of her officials, the patience and persistent courage of her people will be recurrently, severely tested. I am confident she will continue successfully to carve out her destiny and justify our confidence in her substantial contribution to a peaceful democratic world.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] on this important anniversary.

A year ago I took note in this House of the first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Israel. Another year has passed. The democratic state of Israel has sunk its roots a little deeper in the soil of that historic land. The free world will rejoice that the Republic of Israel

flourishes and makes progress as a democratic nation.

Democracy is a precious plant. We in the United States should help it to grow wherever we can in a world where the noxious weeds of totalitarianism spring up so swiftly.

The 2-year-old State of Israel is not yet firmly rooted. Hostile Arabs have not yet put away their arms after an initial attempt to destroy this fledgling state. With the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], I deplore the fact that an armament race seems to be in the making. The contending peoples, Jew and Arab alike, could far better devote their resources and energy to peaceful pursuits and to building a better life.

The United States has demonstrated its concern for the people in the Middle East by giving technical and financial aid in preparing for the rebuilding of areas blighted by centuries of poverty and neglect. I sincerely hope that this aid will be extended and made more generous in the days to come.

To the people of Israel we should continue to offer a sympathetic and strong helping hand. They are beset with tasks of unbelievable magnitude in caring for newcomers by the hundreds of thousands, and in preparing these new arrivals for settled community life. The people of Israel are meeting these tasks with courage and enormous vitality. They seek peace, not war. They want to pursue the opportunity, so long denied, to live and prosper as a democratic nation. We wish them well on the second anniversary of their creation as a sovereign state.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice with my colleagues on the occasion of the second anniversary of Israel. This is a better world because to the family of nations two years ago there was added this new member, and the accomplishments during the two years of its existence of the young Republic of Israel have been a source of happiness and pride to all of us. A bond of understanding and of similar aspiration in attaining for all men through the instrumentality of free government an ever greater measure of human contentment unites the people of the United States and the people of Israel. On this anniversary occasion we in the Congress of the United States would wish to send to the government and the people of Israel renewed assurance of our affection and of our abiding friendship. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], whose outstanding service in this body has been but another of the many contributions to the welfare of mankind by those of Jewish faith, for yielding to me on such a joyous occasion as the observance here of Israel's second birthday. During the long roll of the centuries when the Jews served in every land, in the building of the pillars of civilization, and for a land of their own had only a prayer and a dream, they had opportunity to study all the forms of government which man had devised and had tried. It is natural

that we in the United States should be pleased and complimented that when the centuries-long prayer and dream of a Jewish homeland came into reality it was the American form of government which was adopted. Truly, Mr. Speaker, the United States of America and Israel are firmly bound together.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it was on November 29, 1947, that the United Nations passed a resolution to establish a Jewish State in the British Mandate of Palestine. While this was a world-wide recognition of the 2,000-year struggle of the Jewish people to regain their homeland, it was not until May 14, 1948, that the Jewish State was proclaimed and the British mandate came to an end.

And on that memorable day—May 14, 1948—began the struggle of the world's newest democracy against the ravages of invasion and war. In a baptism of fire, as it were, the Republic of Israel has stood the test. Today the people of Israel are preparing for their second anniversary. They have every reason to be proud of their accomplishments. The world, and especially the United States, looks forward to a strengthening of democratic ties in the Middle East. The cultural achievements Jews have made in every country where they have settled in the past will now find fruition in the Middle East.

We, in the United States, are proud that we have helped play a role in the establishment of Israel. We know how much the Jews of eastern and central Europe yearned for Palestine. We know what the rise of Hitlerism did to their numbers and their hope. With the rise of Hitlerism, Palestine became a real land of promise. The opening of her gates would have been a real weapon in the war against nazism and fascism. But we know this was not done until 3 years after that most terrible of all wars. In the meantime, 6,000,000 Jews of Europe lost their lives.

I think we should pay tribute to the many Jews who have contributed to the development and progress of the United States. Did not a Jewish friend of George Washington go into poverty because he gave all his money to the cause of our freedom? Judah P. Benjamin was in the Confederate Cabinet. Samuel Gompers, who founded the American Federation of Labor, and Sidney Hillman are but two who fought valiantly to advance the cause of American labor. Irving Berlin and George Gershwin gave us memorable music. And what of the philanthropists? There are only a handful of really wealthy Jews in the United States, but they stand among our greatest philanthropists. To mention only a few, there are the Rosenwalds, Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Strauses, and the Guggenheims. Julius Rosenwald alone helped establish more than 5,000 Negro schools in the United States.

With the example of what Jews in other lands have accomplished, I feel certain that one of the great cultural and democratic centers of the world of tomorrow will be Israel. Its second anniversary is a cause for rejoicing throughout the democratic world.

I recently, with a number of Congressmen, called on the Secretary of State to protest the shipment of arms to the Arabs by the British in the hope that Israel would be able to spend its time and money building up the country for peacetime security rather than enter into an armament race. I considered it a privilege in the past to lend my services and assistance in the creation of the State of Israel, and I feel that it would be a great tragedy if the Government of Israel were forced to enter an armament race and divert manpower, capital, and energy into preparation for defense and away from the work of reconstruction and rehabilitation it is now conducting in Israel.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on this great historic occasion—the second anniversary of Israel's proclamation of independence—we Americans salute the establishment of the Third Jewish Commonwealth, founded on the eternal principles of freedom, liberty, and justice which cement our own system of government and way of life. It is my profound pleasure to participate on this memorable occasion.

Israel had its glorious days in the Holy Land. Great happenings and great events have transpired there. For centuries Israel was bleeding in exile, crying in pain, her soul aflame, recalling the glory of old in the promised land; and lifting her eyes while in awe proclaiming the Holy Name is stretching his hands to Jerusalem. For 20 centuries the yearning of the Jews for Palestine did not abate. In prophetic faith the Jews continued to believe that—I quote from the prophet Amos, chapter 9:

The days come . . . that . . . I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof . . . and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land.

This prophecy has been fulfilled and is now an accomplished fact.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian world, and the United States in particular, faithful to their principles of idealism, truth, and justice, have contributed no small part in the struggle of the Jewish people against overwhelming odds and destructive forces. The United States Congress faithfully endorsed and acknowledged the historic right of the restoration of the Jews to their ancient homeland. Indeed, the American people take great pride in the fact that it was the President of the United States who was gloriously destined to be the first statesman of the world to recognize the establishment of the State of Israel and thus, because of this epoch-making event, President Truman and our beloved country and people found an everlasting place in the history of mankind.

Our President, our country, and our people associated themselves with a historic event which by comparison transcends many other great happenings: a great people scattered throughout the four corners of the earth have been liberated—restored to their nationhood, a God-intoxicated people who spread the

God-idea like wildfire and wherever they went the Jews brought with them thoughts of liberty and freedom, of justice, truth, and mercy. The great religion of Christianity—the daughter of Judaism—and other profound religions influenced by Judaism spiritually and beautifully enriched the world.

We the people of the United States deplore, however, the chauvinism, intrigues, and manipulations of nefarious forces attempting to hinder, obstruct, nay, to destroy the infant State of Israel. And who are these nefarious groups: the perfidious Albions as distinguished from the Biblical Britons, are shipping arms to the spiritually blind Arab leaders who are misleading their people and are propagandizing and preparing with the assistance of the perfidious Bevins, a nefarious, ignoble war against the young State of Israel.

To the perfidious Bevins we say: The eternal principles of truth and justice are more powerful than arms, tanks, guns, powder, yea, even more powerful than atom bombs.

To the spiritually blind leaders of the Arabs we unqualifiedly state that the spirit of freedom and liberty is unconquerable. Just as the mischievous collaboration of the ex-Mufti with Hitlerism has ignobly and ingloriously failed, so any attempt on their part to make an attack upon the newly born State of Israel will fail and bloody efforts will be crushed and ground to pieces.

We know that a representative of the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem was given an official seat in the council of the Arab League in recent session in Cairo, Egypt—the very ex-Mufti who collaborated with Hitlerism in its war of destruction of the civilized world.

There is surely a way out of the useless struggle between the Arab people and the State of Israel. These Semitic peoples can and must unite in a common brotherhood and build a civilization based on freedom and liberty to the best interests of their people and, consequently, to the benefit of all mankind.

We the people of the United States favor a strong democratic republic in the State of Israel. With God's help and the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Jewish people all our prophecies for Israel can be fulfilled. On this historic occasion of the second anniversary of Israel's independence, we the people of the United States of every race, creed, and color, salute the State of Israel as when the golden sun salutes the morn.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the second year of independence of the State of Israel, I want to take advantage of the opportunity to congratulate the President of Israel, Chaim Weizmann, the Premier-Minister, David Ben-Gurion, and all of the officials and people of Israel on the splendid progress and advancement which the new state has made in the past 2 years and to express the hope that the future will bring continued growth and prosperity. The rapid progress and development which Israel has made since its independence is an accomplishment of which the Jewish people all over the world might be justly

proud. To Israel well-wishers everywhere I should like to extend a sincerely heartfelt "shalom."

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the Government of the United States should extend the heartfelt felicitations of its citizens to the free and sovereign State of Israel on the occasion of its second anniversary as an independent nation. The glorious heritage which history has bequeathed to this newest of nations serves as an inspiration to the freedom-loving people of all lands.

The rebirth of Israel is a magnificent tribute to the loyalty, devotion, and determination of its twentieth century founding fathers. The reestablishment of Israel as an independent state in the community of nations affords a particular sense of joy to Americans, for the United States was privileged to have spearheaded this historic venture and give encouragement to all who participated in this inspiring movement.

As we are aware of the many obstacles which beset the colonial days of our own beloved country, so we should also be cognizant of the deliberate hindrances being placed in the path of Israel today. Mindful of these things, it is important that the United States continue to stand squarely behind its pledges to Israel and thus provide a full measure of assurance that it will continue to flourish and prosper as a new and strong link in the chain of democratic governments.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on this day of the celebration of the second year of Israel's independence, let the hand of the United States be held out in firm friendship to the new Republic of Israel.

Some short years ago, few would have predicted that the vision of a free and independent State of Israel would be translated into reality. The drama of the re-emergence of the land of Israel has left its impact on the world.

Democracy has its one defender in the Middle East, and that is the State of Israel. It is therefore, to the supreme interest of the United States that this democracy be maintained and strengthened. Any encouragement of forces tending to destroy Israel is a blow against democracy. In the interest of peace and in the interest of democracy, we must severely protest the shipment of arms by Britain to Egypt and Iraq—arms which include fighters and bombers. The refusal of Britain to sell arms to Israel and at the same time the selling of them to Iraq and Egypt is a breach of international faith, and not for a moment should the United States withhold its protest.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is only proper and fitting that the House of Representatives should pause in its deliberations today to take note of the second anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel.

For after all, the United States was the first Nation to give recognition to this new state, and it was the driving force of the power of moral suasion exerted by American public opinion which played a great part in its creation.

Today the infant nation is struggling through the pangs of growth to achieve its goals of security and economic sta-

bility. Surrounded, as it is, by hostile states, still unreconciled to its existence, Israel must devote a substantial portion of its revenues to arming for defense against potential renewal of the war it won in its first year of life.

Only the rivalries among the various Arab states keeps them from springing again into aggressive action against Israel.

But even in the midst of the uncertain peace in the Holy Land the people of Israel are going forward, like our own American pioneers, in the building of a nation of freemen.

From the day of their proclamation of independence their doors have stood open to Jews all over the world and particularly their homeless, wandering brethren of Europe—the victims of concentration camps, the survivors of Hitler's purge of millions.

In the first 2 years, in spite of all the tasks of organizing the new government, fighting a war, and maintaining the normal activity of farming and industry, 400,000 immigrants were admitted.

Returning to their Biblical homeland after more than 2,000 years these men, women, and children find an actual and a spiritual haven that could be theirs nowhere else in the world.

They labor in the fields, building irrigation systems, to make productive once more the land where milk and honey once flowed, to wrest a living from the eroded soil, to make flowers bloom in the desert. They are working in the cities to develop industry, commerce, and trade with other nations.

Political freedom was a fact in Israel when it was born. Economic freedom it is now struggling to achieve.

That it has progressed thus far in 2 years—against the opposition and the arms of the immediate neighbor foes—and against the indirect diplomatic obstacles imposed by powerful enemies such as Britain, who would make it the pawn of international power politics—is all to the credit of the valor of the fledgling state.

May it prosper and thrive. May this little island of democracy in the heart of the troubled Middle East continue to stand as a bulwark against the forces of totalitarianism that are reaching out to extend their influence in every direction.

On its second anniversary, Israel, we salute you.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, April 22, 1950, was a day of great joy and celebration in Israel because it marked the second anniversary of its statehood. We in America rejoice with them on this happy occasion and are proud of the fact that our country was among the first in giving Israel its official blessing and recognition. We are proud, too, that they have patterned their government after our own Republic and we are anxious for it to take its place in the family of nations. We know, when fully organized, that it will emerge the strongest and most effective outpost of democracy in the Near East, and a vital force for peace in that region of the world.

In the two short years of its existence, Israel has made tremendous strides in its development. It is aiming to establish

a higher standard of living for its people and it is vitally interested in the economic development of the Near East in order to benefit all the inhabitants of that region. The problem of consolidation, immigration, and absorption constituted a hard struggle. This was more than a new nation could accomplish alone. It received moral and political assistance from America. It has received magnificent assistance from their coreligious American brothers who are doing for them what Haym Salomon did for us in helping to establish our Republic.

Here on the second anniversary is the wonder of a dream cherished through 1,000 years—which has come into being—a nation built on sacrifice, on heroism, and on the recognition of the rights of man.

Must we not, then, men and women of all faiths and all nations, be aroused to help preserve a freedom-loving people as the people of Israel?

Must we not cry to them to hold on to their beliefs—to their dreams and their hopes? Let them never abandon their vision of the future, their promised land.

And must we not do all in our power to insure their existence so that Israel may grow to maturity in a family of peaceful nations? Let us help them to play their role in history. This is one of the hopes of our world.

America, the strongest country of the western democracies, can play a decisive role in bringing stability and peaceful development to Israel. This is the dominant object of American policy. In line with this reason, I communicated the following to our Secretary of State, the Honorable Mr. Acheson:

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was privileged to be a member of the congressional delegation which met with you on March 28 to discuss the armament situation in the Near East.

At that meeting, you disclosed to our delegation a number of interesting and confidential facts on the problem of armament. I was very much impressed by the information you gave us. At the time, you confided to us that the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France, and the United States will meet in London next month in order to reach an agreement on establishing a strong and unified western policy. Thank God you will meet in London with a unified American foreign policy.

It is with regret that the Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia will not attend. The leaders of that country alone are blocking our goal—peace.

High on the agenda of this meeting is a discussion of far eastern policy. You committed yourself to talk over with the Minister of Great Britain the problem of armament for the Near East. I am in disagreement with the policy of accepting England's arming of Egypt. I believe the unrest in this area can be overcome in three ways which I respectfully submit to you.

1. The United States and Great Britain should develop a coordinated course of action whereby limited quantities of arms would be made available to Israel in the same manner as they are being made available to the Arab states, in this way creating a balance of armament for security reasons in the Near East.

2. After this balance of armaments between Israel and the Arab states will have been established, both Great Britain and the United States cease all further shipments of arms to these countries.

3. Simultaneously, the United States and Great Britain should undertake immediate and earnest efforts to reach an understanding and obtain permanent peace treaties between Israel and the Arab states, in order to replace the present armistice agreements between these countries and thus afford the entire Near East a feeling of confidence and security and an opportunity to resolve their internal problems.

Respectfully yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, we have chosen this hour to celebrate the second anniversary of the independent nation of Israel. It is our proper purpose to honor the gallant people, living and dead, who re-created a free nation while still in mourning for the saddest years of a tragic history.

We ought also to take this opportunity to celebrate something more—the fact that this free state has in 2 years established a bastion of democracy at that middle eastern crossroads where two ideologies meet.

We in this country have often been thanked for our contributions to the establishment of Israel as a free and equal partner in the company of nations. It is now time that gratitude begin to flow from this country to Israel.

This is a restless and uneasy world. The shifting tides of political events make friends of enemies and enemies of friends, particularly in the Middle East. But, there, thank God, stands one firm, free nation whose friendship for us is rooted in a common heritage of democracy and the dignity of individual man.

In an area in which corruption has long been the political rule, in which poverty and ignorance have moved in an endless and worsening cycle, Israel has reversed the cycle. The government is a model of rectitude, the true instrument of a democratic citizenry. Education and the application of modern social principles and techniques are bringing a new wealth to the land, wealth of the mind and spirit as well as of the land.

To have one such example, not only in the Middle East, but in the world, to have watched its miracle take shape in two incredible years, is to restore our faith in ourselves and our ideals. For their ideals are our ideals and their future is our future.

We owe Israel gratitude for her unwavering strength in the ideological warfare which now rages in the Middle East, but we owe her even greater gratitude for the optimism which she has restored to those defending freedom against the onslaughts of tyranny.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Israel celebrates the second year of its birth as a sovereign democratic nation.

An age-old dream of nationhood gradually changes into the reality of practical statesmanship. This new Republic has won prompt acceptance into the organized family of nations. It has held free elections and organized a working government. It is grappling with

the momentous problems of daily living. It deserves all the sympathy and help which we can give.

The tasks of peace are almost overwhelming for this new Republic. Thousands of Jews sail to its shores or travel across the desert to its border each month, seeking new homes, seeking an opportunity to live out their lives free from persecution and fear. Every resource of Israel is strained to the utmost to take care of settlers and to integrate them into the economic and social life of the country.

It would be most unfortunate if the resources so desperately needed to provide food, shelter, and other basic living needs, and to develop the productive facilities of the country, must continue to be diverted to military uses. For Israel still stands in the shadow of armed conflict. Hostile leaders from the Arab nations have not accepted the verdict of history forged in the fire of a bitter war. These hostile nations are reported to be importing arms against the day when the battle will be renewed. For the sake of Arabs and Jews alike, and for the sake of world peace, I hope that arms will be put aside for the plough. Too many peoples of the middle east are suffering from hunger and disease and neglect. They need food. They need even the simple rudiments of an education. They need to share in the simple blessings of decent living, to be given the means to work their way out of utter poverty and degradation.

The democratic state of Israel stands out like an oasis in this desert of suffering humanity. The people of Israel suffer, too, but they do not take it lying down. They are attacking their problems with illimitable courage and resourcefulness. They are working, building, studying, and legislating to make for themselves a modern state. Let us rejoice that they have chosen the modern and democratic way in a world where feudal and totalitarian methods still have great sway.

Let us hold out to them the welcome hand of friendship and urge others to be at peace with them, so that the fragments of a shattered humanity can be welded together into a strong, free, and independent nation working out its destiny, and making its rightful contribution to the civilization of which it is a part.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on this second anniversary of the rebirth of the State of Israel, I want to join with my colleagues in the House and with Americans throughout the Nation in saluting this tiny Republic.

Not only the Jewish people are celebrating this memorable event. They are joined by freedom-loving peoples everywhere in commemorating the reestablishment of the centuries-old dream of a Jewish national homeland and the outpost of democracy in the Middle East.

All religious faiths and all men of good will rejoice in the reestablishment of peace in the Holy Land, and wish for Israel and the entire Middle East peace and prosperity.

During the last World War, over 6,000,000 members of the Jewish faith were tortured and exterminated in the in-

famous gas chambers and prison camps of Europe. The new State of Israel has made splendid strides in welcoming and assimilating the shattered remnants of Jewish displaced persons from all over Europe.

The people of Israel are thinking in terms of an active peace policy, of mutual help and cooperation for the benefit of the entire Middle East. They are anxious to increase the economic development and to accomplish the social program designed to raise the standard of living in the Middle East. They are endeavoring to promote the stability and progress and independence of the entire Middle East area and are thus making an important contribution toward the strengthening of world peace.

For those of us who rejoice in the reestablishment of this historic state, there is more than we can do. We can give tangible evidence of our good will to help bolster this infant democracy. I refer to the problem of the arming of the Arab states by Great Britain. As everyone knows, the Arab states are still festering under their recent military defeat and are only awaiting another chance to rise again against the people of Israel.

Recently, along with a delegation of 32 Congressmen, I called upon Secretary of State Acheson to protest this action. Our delegation was concerned with the fact that tanks, planes, and military equipment are pouring into Egypt and the other Arab states, far beyond the normal requirements for self-defense. We urged that the State Department lodge a protest with the British Government, through the United Nations, so that a stop may be put to the excessive sale of arms to the Arab states. We pointed out that such a sale of arms might well make the Middle East the tinderbox of another war which would most surely engulf all nations in its wake.

Therefore, on this historic occasion I think it only fitting and proper to bring this vitally important matter to the attention of the Congress once again and to remind Secretary Acheson of our protest. I again urge that the United States take action through the United Nations for in my opinion such a step would do much to insure peace, not only in the Middle East, but throughout the world.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, from President Truman on down, Americans of all races and creeds are today sending birthday greetings to our sister Republic of Israel. It is fitting that we do this because, in spite of many differences, our two countries share a common outlook—on the truly important things. More and more Americans who are not Jewish are recognizing this. As one of those who is active in the National Christian Committee of the United Jewish Appeal, I have had direct experience with this. The friendly cooperation which we are getting from so many fine people is proof enough that the meaning of this second anniversary of Israel's rebirth is plain to many, many Americans.

What is this second anniversary of the birth of Israel, if not a perfect testimony to the fact that dreams are not empty? There is an indomitability in the human spirit. There is reason to believe—to have faith in the ultimate achievement

of great objectives, no matter how remote they appear. "If you will it, it is no dream," said Theodore Herzl. Oliver Wendell Holmes said in words which have implicit in them the same meaning: "It is not important where you are at a given moment. What is important is the direction in which you are going." The people of Israel and their forefathers before them have always known where they were going. Their sacrifices through the centuries have been possible because of the courage and faith they have always had to strive for their ultimate goal. Each and every one of them has a share in the success which is Israel today. They have shown that ideals can even thwart the politics of empires; that those who cherish freedom can turn back the hordes of oppression and persecution. As laborers in the vineyards of peace through freedom and democracy, they deserve America's salute.

The early pioneers of Israel had many an object lesson around them. In Palestine itself, they saw the cruel exploitation of the Arab fellaheen, the sharecroppers who lived at almost an animal level, and they saw the extremely opulent life of the pashas and effendis to whom indeed the fellaheen were animals. They wanted none of that.

In neighboring Iraq they saw a population of which by far the vast majority was illiterate, diseased, and utterly without ambition. The life expectancy of the human male was little more than 30 years, and infant mortality was appallingly high. They wanted none of that.

In neighboring Egypt, a land where 1,500 pashas ruled more than 15,000,000 people, they saw the hideous poverty of the great masses—a poverty which can be underlined in one unemotional statistic—that today 1 out of every 10 Egyptians is blind because of trachoma, a disease of filth, ignorance, and poverty. They saw the incredibly wealthy Egyptian upper classes and the incredibly poor in the teeming slums of Cairo and Alexandria.

They wanted none of that.

And vivid in their minds was the memory of the society they had left—of the all-pervading antisemitism and vicious persecution; of the economic slavery; of the hopelessness of Jewish life in Russia and Poland and Hungary and Rumania.

And they wanted none of that.

They strengthened their hearts with hope; and with absolute faith in themselves and in the dream which had possessed them for so many centuries, they set out for Palestine and the holy soil of Israel. Physically and spiritually they went from bondage into freedom.

They were determined to build soundly and well. Chief among their tools, chief among the weapons with which they attacked this ancient, festering sore—the tragic social and economic structure of the Middle East—were courage and imagination.

The years that have passed bear witness to what they achieved.

What then do we see in Israel as a result of all this? We see a government in which labor and capital have been joined together so successfully and so

harmoniously in a cooperative unity that it challenges all of us.

Each passing week, as Israel grows stronger and more stable, provides evidence of what is being done. Just a few weeks ago the government of Israel found it consistent with its basic policy to enact a statute providing special privileges for private investors in Israel.

This law, designed to encourage capital investments in undertakings calculated to help Israel's productive power, will at the same time increase its capacity to absorb large scale immigration.

Because of such actions—I believe it is not an overstatement to say that in Israel we see labor and capital working in an enlightened partnership. Here there may be a key to the problem of building up the depressed areas of the world, which is, after all, one of the prime objectives of our own free democracy. Several American companies have already taken advantage of the industrial and economic benefits granted through this statute. This is a gratifying development—and a bold and wise stroke—on their part. For the government of Israel today represents some of the most progressive political and economic thinking anywhere in the world. It is a thriving and forward-looking community of free people.

As I see it, democracy in our day is expressed by two major movements. One is the western European movement of social democracy. Ours is the American movement of liberal democracy. These movements both represent an essential respect for the dignity and freedom of the individual. Both rely upon democratic political forms, although they differ in their concepts of property relations.

Both accept the principles of our Bill of Rights—namely free speech, free press, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, and all of the checks and balances necessary to a modern society to prevent abuse, persecution, or exploitation of the individual by the state.

All of this can only be to the good. Given a free exchange of ideas—that free exchange that allows political experimentation and correction—this generation and future generations will have the opportunity to judge the comparative merits of social and liberal democracy.

I am a strong adherent of the liberal democracy that is America. I think it is the finest and most successful in the world. But we cannot object to other forms of democracy in the world so long as they are truly free, so long as the individual citizen has been given the absolute right and opportunity to shop in the free market place of ideas.

For example, in Israel today with its progressive-minded labor government, the world has the chance to see both types of democracy in action. The co-operatives—the publicly operated institutions, the collective settlements, the government's extensive security system—all these constitute the elements of a social democracy.

At the same time, the privately owned and operated enterprises represent a basis for a liberal democracy.

We must remember that Israel is today the bridgehead to the Eastern world.

It is a country which presents a constructive, enlightened, democratic alternative opposed to communism and its inevitable totalitarian dictatorship.

Let us not forget the deep debt we all owe to the leadership of Harry S. Truman, because of his unfaltering conviction that the people of Israel could and would constitute a foundation for democracy in the entire Middle East. He knew, as we all do, that the people of Israel are furnishing a practical answer to the feudalism which enslaves that vast segment of mankind. It was no accident that Russia passed directly from the hands of an absolute czar into the hands of a political dictatorship. This was a transition from feudalism to dictatorship. It was no accident that the government of China, with its peoples still steeped in feudal living, has now passed from that feudalism into totalitarian dictatorship.

How fortunate it is for us, as Americans, that there is now in the Middle East an island of democracy which does offer an alternative to feudalism and communism, and one which recognizes the freedom of man and the inviolate dignity of the human being.

Today this outpost of freedom and democracy considers itself once again threatened by the sale of arms by Great Britain to Egypt, and to the Arab world. The sale of arms to those nations who talk of a second round against Israel. To those nations who flouted the expressed will of the United Nations and waged an aggressive, although unsuccessful, war against Israel. I suggest that we have put the cart before the horse. I suggest that it is imperative to the western world that the nations of the Middle East first establish a stable and lasting peace. I suggest that the Arab nations must prove their good faith and their sincerity to the United Nations by negotiating peace treaties with the State of Israel now. I can understand the nervous desire of the Western Powers to establish an area of strength in the Middle East, but I am convinced that strength will develop and flow from peace itself. If the nations of the Middle East can reach an understanding based on mutual trust and respect, they will then be better prepared to unite and defend themselves against an aggressor. But, as I have said, we now have the cart before the horse. We must stop shipping arms, we must direct all our efforts to secure peace.

Jet planes and tanks, radar and armored divisions are only incidents of strength. The defeat of communism in Western Europe has been achieved not by weapons, but by the restoration of faith in the freedom and dignity of the individual. This has come about by the revival of economic stability under the Marshall plan. The Atlantic Pact and the military aid program would have been useless had not Europe been helped to economic recovery through the success of the Marshall plan.

Lasting peace can best be achieved if mankind is both free and secure. By continuing the Marshall plan and through the point 4 program we can help the less fortunate seekers of freedom, to

raise their standards of living, develop their raw materials, increase their productivity. In short, to achieve that economic stability on which the freedom of the individual rests most securely. If we are to compete successfully with the Communist promise of bread, we must start now to put into effect our program of economic and technical assistance to southeastern Asia, to the great subcontinent of Asia, to Africa and to the Middle East.

But democracy is more than an economic program, it must be a crusade of peoples with faith in freedom. It is that kind of faith which, against all odds, has made possible the creation of Israel, which made possible the creation of our own great Nation.

We in America are revived and renewed by this example, which is Israel. We are inspired to live our faith, to practice our faith, to cherish our individual liberty and in so doing to fight together with other free people for the achievement of the dream of mankind—to bring peace to the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is in the great American tradition to encourage peoples to establish and secure their independence and freedom. In the case of Israel this general disposition on the part of the people of the United States is fortified by many factors. First, our Presidents since Woodrow Wilson at the time of the Balfour Declaration have affirmed and supported the aspirations of the Jewish people for a national home in Palestine. Second, the people of the United States through the Congress have by resolution tendered their support for these aspirations and this policy. Third, the United States supported the partition of Palestine according to the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of November 27, 1947, and was the first state to recognize the new state of Israel on May 14, 1948. There are deep bonds of understanding and sympathy between the United States and Israel. These rest not alone on the presence in our country of almost 5,000,000 of the co-religionists of the harassed persecuted and martyred Jews of Europe, the remnants of whom have found sanctuary in Israel, but also upon the fact that Israel opens for the Near East a great new window for the admission of western opportunities and western freedoms.

Into this vast area of seriously and chronically depressed economic conditions for the Near East peoples, abnormally high disease and infant-mortality rates, high rates of illiteracy, erosion, and other deterioration of agricultural land and grave deficiencies of health, sanitation, and water supply, Israel has an enormous opportunity for bringing well-being, advancement, progress in every field, and badly needed consumer goods. Economic and social conditions in this area are so serious that it is one of the most susceptible to the dangers of misleading and incendiary Communist and other fanatical agitations. The tension introduced by the aggression of the Arab States against Israel and the subsequent Arab-Israeli war now in a state of armistice, has been exploited by irresponsible elements to avoid essentially needed reforms and improvements. It

is critically necessary to the peace and security of this area and therefore to the peace and security of the world that improvements and reforms be undertaken instead of being suppressed, or avoided by fanatical appeals to the passions of the Arab peoples. In this, the United States has a great and pressing national interest.

The problems of Israel are overwhelming and would to any people less heroic be crushing, but to the Israeli people who showed their flaming courage, determination, and devotion during the Arab-Israeli war they are but a challenge to achievement. These grave problems include the arms race attributable to continued shipments of heavy arms and munitions of warlike jet fighter aircraft to the Arab States by Great Britain, the fulminations of Arab leaders promising a second round of the war against Israel, essential and complete mobilization of Israel due to the fact that she is in a dangerous situation of armistice, not peace, with the Arab States whose armies continue in Palestine right on the borders of Israel, the presence of 8 to 10 percent of the whole Israeli population in temporary refugee camps and the Arab boycott of Israel just reasserted by the Arab League.

This is a delicate moment in the Near East; a firm and wise policy on the part of the United States is the important key to a constructive solution for Arabs and Jews alike. The people of Israel can be relied on to perform heroically in economic and social rehabilitation and in the absorption of refugees. The Jewish people of the United States joined by millions of Americans of the Christian faith can be relied upon to perform heroically in making the necessary money available. The United Nations can be relied upon with generous American help to make progress in its task of caring for the unfortunate Arab refugees who left their homes under the urging of fanatical Arab leaders but who now do not undertake the commensurate responsibility to them. But to weld all this together into a pattern of peace, social and economic development in the Near East requires a high order of leadership in foreign policy in that area. Let us hope that the great gift which the American people will confer upon the heroic people of Israel on this their second anniversary will be such help and such leadership as will go far to transform the whole Near East of which Israel is now part and bring peace and well-being to all its people.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the second anniversary of the proud nation of Israel, I should like to note that we who have watched the blossoming of this Republic have never doubted for a moment its stability. Neither have we doubted that Israel would take its place among the most progressive democracies on this globe. We look forward in the years ahead to endless other anniversaries, each portending a further strengthening of democratic ideals in the Middle East.

On May 14, 1948, when President Truman flashed word to the new nation that we had been the first to recognize Israel, it was a fitting climax to the

2,000-year struggle of these people to establish a world of their own. That they had to fight for every inch of their territory, at some places with their backs literally to the sea, is proof enough that they believed in their own destiny. After a decade of torture on the continent of Europe, they proved for all times that they are among the best of the earth's fighters. Since that historic day, May 14, 1948, this country and the other democracies of the world have reaped untold benefits from the establishment of Israel. Those brave people have earned our unlimited assistance in strengthening and adding to their well-being. They can count on Congress and the people of the United States to help them when they need our aid. We have taken the lead in winning for them world-wide recognition, recognition by the United Nations, and have extended to them a credit of \$100,000,000. By these actions we have forged a bond of eternal friendship.

The Middle East, a long festering spot in an anxious world, is set to become a show place for mankind. With the ingenuity of the Israelis, the Middle East will also flourish economically. And the people of Israel who went on alone, ceaselessly, to convert Arab deserts to an abundant oasis will play a key role in raising man's sights in his search for higher standards of living, peace, and freedom.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to salute the State of Israel on the anniversary of her second year of independence. We rejoice in her freedom, and in the knowledge that she has earned the respect and acclaim of democracies the world over.

It is doubtful that any new state has ever been faced with the unsurmountable odds which Israel had to overcome. While her people and resources still suffered from the effects of a devastating war, she had to undertake the organization and establishment of her government, and assume her rightful place among the nations of the world. In addition to accomplishing the economic survival for those already within her borders, she became the haven for 400,000 homeless and oppressed human beings who looked to her for shelter. The influx of these persecuted souls taxed her economy and facilities to the limit, but she cheerfully accepted the burden. We know, therefore, that these 2 years have meant great achievement—but also much suffering and sacrifice for the people of Israel. Her one tremendous asset and most powerful weapon, was the undaunted faith and courage of her citizens. The slogan, "Vigilance, austerity, building," aptly describes the spirit of the people. Israel has emerged victorious—she has successfully coped with each and every problem, and she has met every challenge with fortitude. We know that she cannot fail.

While on this happy day, joy should be the keynote, nevertheless, in the heart of every Jew there is a humble prayer for the well-being of Israel. This struggling, new democracy is even now threatened and surrounded by those who would destroy her. Israel seeks peace, and

the opportunity to direct her energies along a constructive path—the building of her country, her economy, and the care of her people. Yet the arms race in the Middle East, resulting in the heavy rearmament of Israel's sworn enemies, the Arab states, seriously threatens her security. We must not minimize the power of those who would conquer her. To fail in vigilance or in rendering her the assistance she deserves as a peace-loving democracy, would be to betray her.

Therefore, we should recognize this as a day of rededication as well as one of gladness. Israel's burdens today are overwhelming. Even as she considers it her duty to care for the oppressed of the world—so should we consider it our duty to help her in the task, for the responsibility rests equally upon us. She is entitled to be assured that the United States respects her national integrity, and that we shall expect other nations to do the same.

Israel will need the concerted efforts of all those interested in her welfare to help her reach her goal—security and peace. In the light of her achievements and the strength and faith shown by her people, we cannot refuse her.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 23 Israel celebrated the second anniversary of its birth as a nation. Few events in our generation have aroused more sympathy among the peoples of the world than the emergence of Israel as an independent nation, after the 2,000 years that the Jews had been without a homeland. The Government of the United States was the pioneer in recognition of this state and the people of the United States have continually given it their support. Today Israel is a nation democratic in character and in action, and we express the sincere hope that it will continue to be democratic and maintain its rightful place among the nations of the world.

The State of Israel is the fulfillment of an age-old dream and hope of the Jewish people. Its establishment required many sacrifices and a long struggle. The American people have always felt a warm bond of friendship and sympathy with the hopes of downtrodden peoples to achieve their freedom and independence. In recent years they have extended this feeling to the Jewish people in their effort to establish a homeland in Palestine. They will continue to extend it to the new state of Israel.

A year ago many of us here in Congress expressed greetings and congratulations to Israel on its first anniversary. We said that they have every reason to be proud of their progress. Today we wish to repeat that statement. Israel has continued to give proof that it will promote peace and democracy in the world. It has demonstrated its ability to stand among the nations of the world as a free and sovereign state. Again we hail it as a member of the family of peace-loving and civilized nations. We wish it a future as rich as its historic past.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel is a vital reality today.

Out of the ashes of chaos and despair the Republic of Israel has emerged,

phoenixlike, to govern itself as a strong independent state. At the close of the second year of its brief but significant history I am honored to have the opportunity to congratulate the State of Israel upon its notable achievements. The dramatic history of one of the youngest republics has been a moral and spiritual inspiration to the world.

Recent visitors to Israel have lauded its Government for creating a new kind of democracy, a labor democracy which may very well serve as a pattern for the Middle East. Israel has been described as a bridgehead to the eastern world and a democratic force furnishing a practical answer to the feudalism which enslaves that segment of mankind. It is a country which presents a constructive, enlightened democratic alternative that is opposed to communism and its inevitable totalitarian dictatorship.

The people of Israel are passionately interested in peace. In fact, they believe the romantic dream of the next 10 years will become a reality if only peace can be obtained now. Under the able leadership of President Weizmann and Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, the 1,200,000 people have magnificent plans for developing their land and resources. Some of these objectives are: the establishment of a policy of unlimited immigration; the development of agriculture and industry to provide more jobs; the irrigation of Negev where oil is said to be; the development of chemical, textile, and metal industries including steel; and, above all, a determination to support a large population of 3,000,000 people. The United States and Great Britain, through their support, have contributed immensely to the progress of the Israeli's plans for economic development, but further success depends entirely on a formal peace with the Arabs.

Israel has demonstrated its ability to put real meaning into peaceful negotiations. Sitting down at a table together, the rival religious and political interests in Israel have achieved remarkable success in working out their mutual social and economic problems. One has only to glance at a chronology of the negotiations between the Arabs and the Jews during the past 2 years to see illustrated a deep spirit of cooperation, a tribute to any nation.

The State of Israel is an advance post in the pioneering efforts of humanity. It has drawn into its borders thousands of the homeless from Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East. For the first time these people have found freedom from fear, a haven of rest from persecution, and the ravages of a cruel war. They do not want a repetition of that disaster whose price in Israel alone, was 10,000 casualties and well over a billion dollars.

In the words of Premier Ben-Gurion:

The Israeli have lived deeply in human brotherhood inside other nations. It has been our desire to create a nation based on the combination of ethics and science. The Israel of the future will be a state based upon democracy, on individual freedom and cooperation between man to man, not on competition.

Peace in the Holy Land is a forward step toward world peace.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unique and truly historic events of our day is the rebirth of the State of Israel, which is now celebrating the second anniversary of its existence as an independent and sovereign state. We, in this country, take note of this event with a great deal of pride and joy. We are proud because it was the United States which played such an important role in the creation of the Jewish state and in aiding it in many ways during the first years of its existence.

Israel's first year of independence was marked by bloodshed, by a struggle for its very life and for the security of its people. At the same time, Israel had to set up its governmental machinery, its parliament and army, its economy and foreign relations. In other words, its people were compelled to engage in a bloody struggle as they were trying to build a country.

In the second year, Israel experienced a period of growth and development, consolidation of its positions, the absorption of several hundred thousand immigrants who came to settle there, and the attainment of international recognition when it was admitted as the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations.

These have been 2 years of great and historic achievements, but they were also years of suffering for the people of Israel. It was not all victory and glory. Victory on the field of battle was costly in human and material resources. Then came the struggle for economic survival for the people of Israel, including the 400,000 new immigrants who were admitted into the Jewish state in the 2 years since it was established.

Faced with almost superhuman problems in the economic sphere, the people of Israel feel certain that they could overcome these problems in time if only they are given the opportunity to live in peace and build in peace. Unfortunately, strong forces of evil are working against them, giving them no respite, giving them no opportunity to build a peaceful haven for those who have been homeless these many years and have known nothing but misery.

Although Israel has been in existence now for two full years and hostilities with its Arab neighbors have ceased more than a year ago, no permanent peace agreements have been reached between Israel and the Arab states. Only a short while ago, the prospects were bright for an early peace between Israel and Jordan, and possibly also with other Arab states. The recent meeting of the Arab League in Cairo has banned all peace negotiations with Israel and has reasserted its old policy of open hostility toward the Jewish state.

Coupling this unmistakable threat to the future existence of Israel with the continuing shipments by Great Britain of arms to the Arab states, and at the same time denying such arms to Israel—it is easy to see why Israel feels that its security is threatened and why it must divert its meager funds to keep up with the arms race in the Near East, instead of using these funds for building homes for the immigrants, purchasing food and

machinery, and setting its economy on a solid foundation.

The United States is vitally interested in the maintenance of a lasting peace in the Near East. Feverish preparations by the Arab states to renew their hostilities against Israel and their sabotage of all peace efforts on the part of Israel constitute a serious threat not only to the future of the Jewish state, but also to the peace of this entire area which is of such strategic importance to our country.

On this day, when Israel celebrates its second anniversary, let us remember that the miracle which is known to us as the State of Israel did not come of itself. It required much suffering, struggle, sacrifice, and no small amount of support. On the occasion of this second anniversary of Israel's independence, it is my fervent wish that our own beloved country, the United States, will use its great prestige and utmost efforts to bring genuine peace to all the peoples of the Near East.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the second anniversary of Israel's independence is being celebrated this week. The rebirth of the State of Israel is an historic event of great significance.

One of the oldest of nations became, in our own day, one of the newest of nations. The record of Israel during the first 2 years of its existence as a free and democratic state is indeed both an example and an inspiration. The proclamation of Israel's independence 2 years ago was sanctified by the blood of its youth in a war for its very life initiated by its Arab neighbors. The heroic achievements and self-sacrifice of Israel's sons and daughters constitute one of the great epics of modern times. The spirit of the Maccabees of old manifested itself in all its glory. However, what is equally important is Israel's achievement in peace. Under the most adverse conditions the gates of Israel were opened wide for the admission of the remnant of European Jewry—the survivors of the Nazi slaughter. Hundreds of thousands of them reached the shores of Israel and are being absorbed into the daily life of the country and are contributing toward the development of a civilization based upon the concepts of social justice, liberty, and peace—the ideals of the ancient prophets of Israel.

Tens of thousands of Jews are flocking to Israel from Arab countries where they found conditions for their existence to be unbearable. These hundreds of thousands of homeless Jews have created a superhuman burden on the infant state of Israel. About 90,000 of these immigrants are compelled to live in camps under unspeakable conditions because of lack of the necessary financial means of meeting the new problems.

It is unfortunate that, at this time, Israel is compelled to divert its funds for the purpose of buying bullets instead of using the funds for stabilizing its economy on a solid foundation.

There is an armament race now in progress between Israel and the Arab states because of the supply of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain, while

denying it at the same time to Israel. In spite of the existing armistice agreements, the Arab leaders are constantly proclaiming their intention of renewing the war against Israel—a war of revenge. It is understandable that under the circumstances Israel cannot expose itself to the mercy of its neighbors and it endeavors to make itself militarily prepared for defense in case of an Arab attack.

It is fitting and proper that we salute the State of Israel on its independence day. The United States of America has the right to claim a share in this celebration. It was our Government which made the largest contribution towards the realization of Israel's independence.

It is my sincere wish that conditions will be created in the Near East which will make possible the substitution of the present armistice agreements by permanent peace treaties for the good of Israel, for the good of the Arabs, as well as in the interest of world peace.

The security of Israel's freedom, like the security of all independent nations, is the security of the freedom of free men everywhere.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my felicitations and best wishes to the people of the sovereign State of Israel on the occasion of their celebration of the second anniversary of the proclamation of its independence. As we all know, a great many of the people of America have made a very substantial contribution to the final achievement of a free and independent Israeli state. The struggle for independence was won only after 2,000 years of broken dreams, strife, unkept promises and disappointments. I am happy to have had some small part in the struggle to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine and accordingly feel entitled to join my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULDER] in rejoicing and celebrating on this second anniversary.

The courage, perseverance and fortitude of the Jewish people during their many years of hardship and struggle is a glorious testimonial to their unswerving faith in finally achieving their goal of independence. The rebirth of the third Israel Commonwealth was an inspiration to free men everywhere and the occasion of a celebration on the second anniversary is an event in which all free and decent peoples should be happy to participate. I feel the occasion is one in which we should also extend congratulations and praise to the Jewish people of America who played such a vital part in the defense of freedom and the right of the Jewish people to independence in Israel, where there is now a friendly asylum for the persecuted and homeless.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the young nation of Israel is to be highly commended for the untiring energy and zeal demonstrated during her 2 years of independence in establishing and maintaining the high principles to which she dedicated herself.

During this 2-year period, Israel has been faced with grave problems, many of which she has coped with most ad-

mirably, but she is still confronted with many more, the solutions to which do not appear on the surface to be easy. Struggling against pioneering hardships, this new nation continues to strive toward freedom, liberty, and democracy, and she does so with the wisdom of a nation that is centuries old—not one that has only two short years of practical experience behind it. Her progressive spirit is demonstrated by the development of medical services that are setting the standard for the whole of the Middle East.

As of January 1950, Israel had opened her gates to over 345,000 displaced persons who sought refuge there, and has already been able to absorb more than two-thirds of them into the economy of the country.

One cannot help but admire the courageous way in which the people of Israel have attacked the tremendous problem of building their political state, and their well-defined planning for the physical rebuilding of the country in terms of both agriculture and industry. The organization of the state and its effect on the lives of the people are a demonstration to the rest of the world of the power of deep consecration to a desired goal and to a firm religious purpose.

We happily find, in the case of Israel, a strong identity of purpose which transcends the miles that lie between us and has brought about the fine cooperation which has been so evident to date in the relationship of our two nations.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion when we cannot escape a feeling of happy satisfaction that a new land of opportunity, a new nation built on the model of our own, the homeland for which those of Jewish faith have hoped for and prayed for during many hard and at times cruel centuries, has reached its second birthday. The first 2 years of the young Republic of Israel have been years of constructive building and of brilliant achievement. I join in congratulating the Government and the people of Israel on the fine accomplishments of these first 2 years of national existence and in heartiest good wishes for all the years ahead.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to extend sincere felicitations to the Republic of Israel upon its second anniversary. While the 2 years just passed have not been easy ones for the Jewish people, they have been marked by achievements so epoch-making that they certainly furnish abundant guaranty for the future of this new nation.

It seems to me it is to the everlasting credit of the Jewish people that during all the troublous days gone by they never wavered in the firm faith that the goal for which they prayed would one day be reached. While centuries were being counted off on the limitless calendar of the universe, a renaissance was silently but surely in the process of fruition and then came the day 2 years ago when the miracle of the birth of Israel occurred and once more a Jewish state made its

appearance on the wondrous stage of history. We in America may justly claim a parallel between the fight of the people of Israel for independence and our own struggle for freedom. Peace-loving people everywhere will express the wish that the new republic may soon find its way into the paths of peace with its neighbors. I am sure that the relations of our own Republic with this new nation of Israel will always be of the most friendly nature and that the bond between us will grow stronger as the years go by.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I will be ever grateful to all of my colleagues who joined me this day in extending felicitations and good wishes to the little Republic of Israel on this, its second anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be granted permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. BROOKS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House of Representatives today upon the question as to how its membership is now, and in the future should be, apportioned among the several States of the United States.

At the outset it might be well for me to trace generally the historical development of the constitutional provisions and statutory law pertaining to this most important subject.

The Constitution of the United States in article I, section 2, paragraph 3, provided originally the following in reference to the apportionment of Representatives in the United States Congress among the several States:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000, but each State shall have at least 1 Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose 3, Massachusetts 8, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations 1, Connecticut 5, New York

6, New Jersey 4, Pennsylvania 8, Delaware 1, Maryland 6, Virginia 10, North Carolina 5, South Carolina 5, and Georgia 3.

It is very well known by all of us that a terrific struggle has been going on almost constantly for many years seeking to extend to all capable and proper persons the privilege of exercising the elective franchise.

The problems as to what should be done in an effort to extend these voting privileges to the citizenry generally, however, was not of such great moment until the advent of the Civil War and afterward when section 2 of article XIV of the amendments of the United States Constitution was passed, same being as follows:

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

Later the adoption of article XV to the Constitution of the United States was brought about in an effort to guarantee that the privilege of voting would not be denied to any qualified person. This article is as follows:

SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I believe that the foregoing embraces all of the constitutional provisions on the subject, and I now wish to call attention to the following statutory enactments by Congress: Title 2, paragraphs 2a, b, and c, relate to the reapportionment of Representatives and other matters, but do not have any particular bearing upon the matter under discussion here.

However, title 2, paragraph 6, is pertinent, because it seeks to prevent a denial of the voting privilege by providing for a reduction in representation if the right to vote is denied. It is as follows:

Reduction of representation.—Should any State deny or abridge the right of any of the male inhabitants thereof, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, to vote at any election named in the amendment to the Constitution, article XIV, section 2, except for participation in the rebellion or other crime, the number of Representatives apportioned to such State shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall have to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

This section has proved to be very ineffective. No way has yet been devised to make the fifteenth amendment to the

United States Constitution really effective and because of that fact I have given the matter a great deal of thought and study, all of which has resulted in the introduction today, by me, of a joint resolution proposing a new amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides a new basis for the apportionment of each State's membership in the House of Representatives of the United States, by ascertaining the average number of persons actually voting for certain national offices in any State during the previous 20 years and using that figure as the norm or standard of each State's representation therein, instead of making apportionments in accordance with the relationship which the total population of each State bears to the total population of the United States of America.

This joint resolution contemplates certain proposed changes in the Constitution of the United States, which I deem to be very necessary at this time. It is as follows:

SECTION 1. After 1 year from the ratification of this article and every 10 years thereafter, Representatives in the Congress of the United States shall be apportioned among the several States according to the general average of the number of qualified voters who actually cast their ballots during the previous 20 years, at national elections for presidential electors, or President if that mode of election be then prescribed by the Constitution, but in no event shall the total number of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the various States exceed in number 435.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Such a constitutional provision instead of restricting the privilege of voting would stimulate voting.

Every State which reduced, or kept its voting strength at a minimum, would decrease its representation in the House of Representatives.

And on the contrary, States which encouraged the use of the elective franchise would have its representation in the House of Representatives increased accordingly.

It has been stated by many writers and speakers having rare political wisdom that if our Government ever perishes it will be due to the fact that the people became so lazy and indifferent to governmental affairs that they will not take the time or go to the trouble of casting their votes. There is much real truth in this statement.

Every year in certain sections of our country, speakers, newspapers, and magazines clamor for the electors to register as voters, and go to the polls and vote, while in other sections of our land only the selected few are privileged to cast ballots and many are prevented from voting by accumulated poll-tax assessments, property and educational qualifications, and many other subter-

fuges, and sometimes by displays of physical force and fear campaigns.

I have heard the statement made that all these restrictions would in due time be removed if patience was exercised by the Congress, but I have a deep conviction that these statements are insincere and are just delaying actions and mere pretenses which will never become realities.

The apportioning of Representatives in Congress in accordance with average voting records is in my opinion far more preferable than to base it on total population.

Why should all the nonvoters, the persons in jails, prisons, insane asylums and correctional institutions, the persons who have forfeited their right to vote because of the conviction for crime, the half-wits, the aliens and all the minors be totaled so as to arrive at an apportionment of representation in the House of Representatives?

I ask what right has any State to gain a representative advantage in the House of Representatives when it refuses to permit people to vote?

If my proposed constitutional amendment is adopted you may rest assured

that every State will endeavor to stimulate voting instead of restricting it.

Before drafting my joint resolution, I had Mr. Robert E. De Vaughn of my office staff make up a chart which tells the story graphically as no other document can, as to the numbers and percentages of the people in the various States of the Union who voted in the 1948 elections for President, Vice President, Senator, where one was running, and Representatives in Congress, as well as the numbers and percentages of people in the various States who did not vote.

This chart is as follows:

Percentages of persons who did vote and did not vote in 1948 election

(These figures were compiled through the use of the Estimated Population of States, including men in the armed forces; and "Statistics of the Presidential and Congressional Election of Nov. 2, 1948," which gives the votes cast for nominees for United States Senators, Representatives, and Delegates to the 81st Cong.)

State	Estimated population over 21	Votes for President and Vice President	Votes for Senator	Votes for Representative	Percentages					
					Did vote			Did not vote		
					President and Vice President	Senator	Representative	President and Vice President	Senator	Representative
New England States:										
Maine.....	570,000	264,787	223,256	213,894	46.4	39.1	37.5	53.6	60.9	62.5
New Hampshire.....	367,000	231,440	222,898	220,363	63.0	60.7	60.0	37.0	39.3	40.0
Massachusetts.....	3,236,000	2,155,347	2,155,347	2,155,346	66.6	66.6	66.6	33.4	33.4	33.4
Vermont.....	238,000	123,382	123,382	122,508	51.8	51.8	51.5	48.2	48.2	48.5
Rhode Island.....	507,000	326,098	320,420	318,577	64.4	63.3	62.9	35.6	36.7	37.1
Connecticut.....	1,378,000	883,518	872,983	920,610	60.4	63.3	66.8	39.6	36.7	33.2
Middle Atlantic States:										
New York.....	10,053,000	6,274,527	6,274,527	5,997,987	62.5	57.0	59.7	37.5	42.9	40.3
New Jersey.....	3,279,000	1,949,555	1,869,882	1,852,441	59.4	57.0	56.4	40.6	43.0	43.6
Pennsylvania.....	7,119,000	3,735,149	3,735,149	3,657,029	52.4	51.3	51.3	47.6	48.7	48.7
East North Central States:										
Ohio.....	5,196,000	2,936,071	2,798,360	2,908,530	56.5	53.8	54.0	43.5	46.2	46.0
Indiana.....	2,558,000	1,656,214	1,656,214	1,633,401	64.7	64.7	63.8	35.3	35.3	36.2
Illinois.....	5,927,000	3,984,046	3,900,285	3,848,640	67.2	65.9	64.9	32.8	34.1	35.1
Michigan.....	3,985,000	2,109,600	2,062,097	2,064,536	52.9	51.7	51.8	47.1	48.3	52.9
Wisconsin.....	2,148,000	1,276,800	1,276,800	1,211,341	59.4	59.4	56.3	40.6	40.6	43.7
West North Central States:										
Minnesota.....	1,907,000	1,212,226	1,220,250	1,181,726	63.5	63.9	61.9	36.5	40.1	38.1
Iowa.....	1,718,000	1,038,294	1,000,412	939,743	60.4	58.2	54.6	40.4	41.8	38.1
Missouri.....	2,624,000	1,578,628	1,578,628	1,565,102	60.1	60.1	59.6	39.9	39.9	40.4
North Dakota.....	332,000	220,716	220,716	190,803	66.5	66.5	57.0	33.5	33.5	57.0
South Dakota.....	388,000	250,105	242,833	240,720	64.4	62.5	62.0	35.6	37.5	38.0
Nebraska.....	849,000	488,939	471,895	460,451	57.7	55.5	54.2	42.3	44.5	45.8
Kansas.....	1,303,000	788,819	716,342	703,910	60.5	54.9	53.9	39.5	45.1	46.1
South Atlantic States:										
Delaware.....	196,000	139,073	141,362	140,535	70.9	72.1	71.7	29.1	27.9	28.3
Maryland.....	1,382,000	596,735	596,735	534,186	43.1	43.1	38.6	56.9	56.9	61.4
Virginia.....	1,807,000	419,256	386,168	383,160	23.2	21.3	21.2	76.8	78.7	78.8
West Virginia.....	1,104,000	748,750	763,888	758,631	67.8	69.1	68.8	32.2	30.9	31.2
North Carolina.....	2,074,000	791,209	764,559	763,513	38.1	36.9	36.8	61.9	63.1	63.2
South Carolina.....	1,049,000	142,571	141,005	140,654	13.5	13.4	13.4	86.5	86.6	86.6
Georgia.....	1,776,000	418,760	362,504	365,355	23.5	20.4	20.5	76.5	79.6	79.5
Florida.....	1,488,000	577,643	577,643	553,013	38.8	38.8	23.7	61.2	61.2	76.3
East South Central States:										
Kentucky.....	1,635,000	822,658	794,469	740,538	50.3	48.6	45.2	49.7	51.4	54.8
Tennessee.....	1,846,000	550,283	499,218	448,973	29.8	27.0	24.3	70.2	73.0	75.7
Alabama.....	1,370,000	214,980	220,875	197,084	13.6	14.0	12.4	86.4	86.0	87.6
Mississippi.....	1,161,000	192,190	151,478	152,537	16.5	13.0	13.1	83.5	87.0	86.9
West South Central States:										
Arkansas.....	1,101,000	242,475	216,401	229,403	22.2	19.6	20.8	77.8	80.4	79.2
Louisiana.....	1,502,000	416,326	330,124	321,576	27.7	21.9	21.4	72.3	80.4	78.6
Oklahoma.....	1,445,000	721,599	708,931	685,085	49.9	49.0	47.4	50.1	51.0	52.6
Texas.....	4,360,000	1,147,245	1,061,563	1,051,853	26.3	24.3	24.1	73.7	75.7	75.9
Mountain States:										
Montana.....	321,000	224,278	221,003	214,549	69.8	68.8	66.8	30.2	31.2	33.2
Idaho.....	318,000	214,816	214,188	211,869	67.5	67.3	66.6	32.5	32.7	33.4
Wyoming.....	172,000	101,425	101,480	97,464	58.9	59.0	56.6	41.1	41.0	43.4
Colorado.....	730,000	515,237	510,121	497,411	70.5	69.8	68.1	29.5	30.2	31.9
New Mexico.....	301,000	185,797	188,495	185,224	61.7	62.6	61.5	38.3	37.4	38.5
Arizona.....	380,000	177,065	177,065	158,975	46.5	46.5	41.8	53.5	53.5	58.2
Utah.....	371,000	276,305	276,305	274,333	74.4	74.4	73.9	25.6	25.6	26.1
Nevada.....	91,000	62,117	62,117	58,705	68.2	68.2	64.5	31.8	31.8	35.5
Pacific States:										
Washington.....	1,671,000	905,059	905,059	817,578	54.2	54.2	48.8	45.8	55.1	51.2
Oregon.....	1,109,000	524,080	498,570	491,142	47.2	44.9	44.2	52.8	55.1	55.8
California.....	6,802,000	4,021,538	4,021,538	3,561,390	59.1	59.1	52.3	40.9	40.9	47.7

TOTAL POPULATION OVER 21 IN THE UNITED STATES, AND TOTALS OF POPULATION OVER 21 WHO DID VOTE AND DID NOT VOTE IN THE 1948 ELECTIONS

	Population over 21	Total votes cast for President and Vice President	Total votes cast for Senators	Total votes cast for Representatives
Total.....	94,072,000	48,833,680	22,682,330	46,265,439
Total percentages:				
Voted.....		51.9	40.2	49.18
Did not vote.....		48.1	59.8	50.81

Legend: Reader will note the small total vote for Senator, as compared by the votes cast for President, Vice President and Representative. In the 1948 election 14 States did not hold senatorial elections. They are as follows: Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, Missouri, North Dakota, Maryland, Florida, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, California. The total vote cast in the States that did hold senatorial elections is 56,185,000, and the percentage as compared with that total is listed above.

Mr. Speaker, a study of this chart shows that inevitably, if this constitutional amendment of mine is adopted, a great shift will be made of membership in the House of Representatives from States where the people have been denied the right to vote, to States where the voting privileges have been freely accorded and encouraged.

I hope that the membership of this House will give some thought and study to my constitutional amendment and give me such help as they feel is just, right and proper, which will enure to the ultimate good of this now great, but ever growing greater Republic.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the gentleman this question: Does he recall the year in which we had the largest turn-out of eligible voters for the Presidency?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. No; I do not, but I just wanted to bring it as nearly up to date as I could. I took the estimated 1948 voting record.

Mr. CANFIELD. I was wondering if there had been a downward trend over the period of a decade or two.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I could not answer as to that; I did not attempt to study that. All I wanted to do here was to show the Members of Congress that this idea of apportioned representation in this Congress according to the population of the State whether the citizens of the State voted or not is all wrong, and there is a great disadvantage to all of these northern, western, and eastern States. If this amendment were adopted, some of these States that allow only 15, 16, or 20 percent of the people to vote would lose representation in this Congress, and other States with large voting populations would gain representation. Perhaps Nebraska would get a few more Members and States where they allow a lot of voting, where there are very few restrictions on the right to vote, they would have increased representation.

My thought is that there is only one way that you are ever going to make some of these States eliminate their voting restrictions, and that is to cause them to lose representation in this Congress. If this provision were adopted, they would be rushing out trying to induce people to vote, trying to interest people in this country, trying to have their stockholders in these United States of America, these people who are citizens, vote their stock. That is the purpose of this.

I hope this chart will be studied. I do not believe there is another available any place. I know that I called up various departments of the Government and was told that they would be anxious to get such a chart, that they did not have such chart available. It is with that thought in mind that I have presented this joint resolution asking for a constitutional amendment. I commend it to every fair-thinking American who wants the people to be interested in their Government to vote their stock in the greatest institution in the world. I

would like to have their help. I do not care for any honor or glory out of this, but I do think the time has come when every State in this Union should be interested, as many of the States are, Illinois, New Jersey, Nebraska, perhaps all of the States in the West, Middle West, central West, and in the East.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska on the fine presentation he has made here today of a matter of vital concern to our democracy here in America. I would have expected such a contribution from the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska knowing his long, brilliant, and outstanding career as a lawyer famous not only in Nebraska but throughout the country west of the Mississippi. I feel that today he has presented a matter that will receive the serious attention of the people of this Republic. I recall that during the first session when we were discussing the poll-tax bill I looked into the election figures and compared the vote in a district in Mississippi and the vote cast in the district that I represent in the State of Illinois; and on the basis of those figures I found that one prime Mississippi voter was the equivalent of 11 voters in my district in Illinois. I made up a list of the 11: the president of the University of Chicago, the superintendent of schools of Chicago, one of the leading doctors of Chicago—I make up a list of 11—and the voting strength of that group of 11 equaled 1 voter in Mississippi. Well, of course, that is not representative government, as the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska has so well and eloquently and powerfully said this afternoon. I do feel we deserve the thanks of the Republic for this fine work he has done.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman for his words of praise which I am sure I do not merit. I thank him sincerely for his being in agreement with what I have said here today.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Nebraska in connection with his observation regarding the light vote as shown by the election returns in general elections for the State of Mississippi that that prevails generally in several other Southern States, as a matter of fact, in most of them, due to the fact that we have only one party in the State, the Democratic Party, and there are no candidates from any other party, therefore there is practically no interest in the general election. However, where the total vote is shown and is cast, is in the primaries, which really reflects the voting population and the voting strength of Mississippi, Louisiana or some of the other Southern States, practically most of the qualified voters come out and vote. But this is not shown and reflected in the returns which are promulgated for general elections, for instance in the national election. Our vote comes out in the Democratic pri-

mary. In my own congressional district we had probably 75,000 or 80,000 registered the first time I was a candidate for Congress who were entitled to vote. There were approximately 50,000 votes cast. Our vote comes out in the primary and is not shown in the figures which are tabulated with respect to the general election. In our gubernatorial campaigns in Louisiana the vote is in excess of 500,000 and when the general election is held there are few people who come to vote. There is no opposition. It is merely a form to elect the nominee of the one party in the respective States.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Of course, it is a rather unhealthy state of affairs to have one political party. According to my notion of the matter this is a republic and a republic contemplates two strong political parties which will vie with each other in trying to do good for the people. It does not contemplate one political party. That one political party idea is very closely allied with a sort of dictatorship. Perhaps it might be a good thing if we did have two vying political parties in the South, two parties that would struggle to give the people a government of and by and for the people instead of and by and for one political party. I do not say that does exist. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has explained to me a reason why there is such a small vote in the Southern States in general elections. I can see now that might enter into it. But we still want to maintain a republic and we ought to have two strong political parties. If I had the power, if the power rested with me, to destroy the Republican Party I would not do it because I think it would be bad for the country, bad for the people and would take us out of the category of a republic to a dictatorship.

Mr. LARCADE. Of course, I do not care to get into a discussion on that subject, but I might say further that while we do not have two parties or more than one party, a full expression of the people is given in the primaries when the nominees for the various offices are nominated. In my State, for instance, we have two factions. The vote is generally very close and the fight is very bitter. So everybody has an opportunity to express his or her preference for the various candidates and the various issues that are presented. I for one am satisfied, and I think most of our people are satisfied, with the system down there. I am not trying to encourage any other party so long as that system exists.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I can understand that, but, after all, if a person is a stockholder in the United States of America, the greatest corporate institute in the world, and is not interested enough in voting his stock and casting a vote of approval at least that does not look hardly right to me.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I was wondering if the gentleman from Nebraska, while he does not wish completely to

annihilate the Republican Party, would be quite content if it remained a major party but slightly in vote-casting strength under the Democratic Party?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I heard a man make a statement one day: "We need the Republican Party because we Democrats always have to have a scrub team to buck up against in order to get into practice." He characterized the present-day Republican Party as a scrub party. I do not believe that. I think it can do much toward keeping the Democratic Party in line, I think it can do a lot, as it did in the days of Abraham Lincoln, before it ran away from Abraham Lincoln, left him crying at the crossroads, I think it can do a lot if it gets back to its old moorings and really tries to give the people a government of and by and for the people, as Jefferson and Lincoln so well expressed it.

I think there is hope for the Republican Party, but there is no hope, of course, if it is going to be a party of big business, by big business, and for big business, and I do not believe it is going to be that way. I think I can see on the other side of the aisle here occasions when men who have the real interests of this country and its people at heart have done a tremendous job, and they are Republicans, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CHICAGO LOYALTY PARADE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House, at a time when we are all gravely concerned over the international situation and possible repercussions from the unprovoked and tragical attack on an American plane engaged in a mission of peace, will be heartened by reports of the manner in which the people of Chicago are preparing to show their loyalty to our country and our democracy on this coming Saturday, April 29, by marching in family groups—men, women, and children—in what is expected to be the greatest, certainly the most impressive and significant, parade in the history of the inland metropolis of the Nation.

It will be a spontaneous outpouring of a quarter of a million Americans, giving up their Saturday half-holiday, to prove by marching down Michigan Boulevard in endless procession that this is a united America with loyalty to God, fellow men, and country the very core of its character.

This is not a parade to incite toward war, but one to strengthen the will to keep the peace. There will be no armed forces in the line of march, no guns, no tanks, none of the martial trappings. Veterans, of course, because none is more devoted to peace than one who has survived the horrors of war—the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the AMVETS, the Disabled War Veterans, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the Polish-American War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, all the veteran organizations. The Boy Scouts, of course, because they want to look ahead

to lives in the vineyards of peace where the daily doing of good deeds is not interrupted by the carnage of Mars. But mostly the paraders will be just ordinary American families—mothers and fathers marching with their children—a quarter of a million of Americans of all ages and from all walks of life turning out spontaneously, unrehearsed and the only pressure upon them being the ardor of their own spirit of loyalty.

I do not pin my faith to loyalty oaths, because I believe that loyalty, like love, is written not in words on a scrap of paper but in the deeds of daily living. We do not encourage the affection of others by beginning with the premise that they hate us and holding doggedly to such presumption until they write it all out in pen and ink that they love us. That is why to me marching voluntarily in a loyalty parade—no one compelling you to, marching just because in your heart is deep loyalty and you wish all the world to know it as you would your love for a friend—is so vastly more potent an expression.

Mr. Speaker, if war is to be avoided—and God grant that against all provocation and crises that may arrive we may have His divine guidance in finding the way to peace—we must make it so perfectly clear to the calculating minds of alien leaders that the probability of success against us is so remote that they will not dare to do that which in their wildest moments they know would be the folly of suicide.

If the portends of war now are much more alarming than they were a year ago—we do not wish to believe that they are, but our common sense cannot permit us to overlook entirely the analogy of the attack upon the plane *Privateer* with the sinking of the *Maine* and the firing upon the *Panay*—then the blame in large part must be accepted by those who have given the world to believe that loyalty among Americans is a virtue so rare that all Americans must be suspected of disloyalty even by their own neighbors until proven otherwise. If that were the case, and the attribute of loyalty in the national character had fallen to such low estate that every American required police scrutiny to reveal him as anything but a traitor, we could not be surprised at a hostile and godless ideology timing us as ripe for a rich and easy picking.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the headlines in the newspapers and the comments over the radio give glaring and dramatic emphasis to the word "disloyalty" and seldom mention the simple and honest word "loyalty." It is unfortunate because it is used by the unfriendly government of the Soviets to divide through misunderstanding the people of our country and of their country, both of whom want peace and not war. We wish the people of Russia to know that we in America have tried democracy and found that it works in maintaining the dignity of man and in advancing human contentment. Their government tells them otherwise, tells them that we are disloyal because we are unhappy, and we are unhappy because our democracy does not work.

This is not the truth, as all of us so well know, but it is made to appear as the truth to the people of Russia by their government's use of American "disloyalty" headlines and wild charges of disloyalty in apparent substantiation of what the Soviet Government is telling its citizenry. I think it would be wise for all in the Congress and in the country at large to give most serious and poised consideration to this phase. That which leads down the path toward war should be avoided. Words of passion and charges of wide disloyalty among any Americans can, when employed, as we know they are, by the Soviet leaders, become words the echo of which ends in the roar of cannon and the explosive thunder of atomic bombs.

Mr. Speaker, among the American people themselves there has never been any question about the loyalty of the American people as a whole. Perhaps no citizenry in all the history of mankind has attained such a full measure of loyalty. The plain truth is that loyalty to our country and our democracy is part of the very fiber of our character. That is why Americans resent question of their loyalty, and demand proof that at heart they are not traitors, as indignantly as a good woman would resent the demand for proof of her chastity because a neighborhood gossip, with a psychopathic twist, has wagged a slanderous tongue.

I respectfully but most earnestly suggest, Mr. Speaker, to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and at this time of concern, which our responsibility will not permit us lightly to shake off, that we set for the country the wholesome example of according to all Americans the presumption that they are true and loyal, leaving it to the regularly constituted policing agencies to detect and bring to justice the few who are not, this in the same sane and orderly manner that we accept all our neighbors as honest, and usually find that they live up to our faith, and the few who are not honest are separated from us by the police whom we have for our protection.

Because it is the best approach to the preservation of the peace, by convincing a potential enemy of the folly of starting trouble with a great people united in loyalty, I am happy that the city from which I come, Chicago, is preparing on such an elaborate scale to participate in the observance of Loyalty Day on this coming Saturday.

I think the House would be interested to know that 2 young women, both of whom I am happy and proud to say are my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, have spark-plugged this great tidal wave of the spirit of loyalty which is sweeping Chicago and which will have its climax in the record-breaking parade on Saturday down beautiful Michigan Boulevard on the shores of Lake Michigan—a parade of 250,000 Americans telling to all the world that loyalty, and not disloyalty, is the word which is the precious and treasured birthright of all Americans.

The patriotic and dynamic young women responsible for this magnificent contribution to the cause of loyalty and

who have worked in conjunction with the Cook County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, sponsoring the parade for the veteran organizations, are Miss Betty McGuire and Miss Adele Whalen, daughter of the Honorable James M. Whalen, clerk of the Appellate Court of Illinois. When I was in Chicago I attended two of the preliminary dinners and conferences at the Chicago Athletic Club, participated in by practically all of the civic leaders of Chicago and the not inconsiderable expenses of which were borne personally by these young women. Commander David Caplow of the Cook County Council and Capelle Damrell, national aide-de-camp of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, told me that they in their wide experience with veteran encampments and activities had never witnessed a more complete job of firing the enthusiasm of so many important leaders than that undertaken and accomplished by Miss McGuire and Miss Whalen.

I might add that Commander Caplow, Aide-de-Camp Damrell, with the other officers and the rank and file of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as of the American Legion and other organizations, including all of the labor groups of A. F. of L., CIO, and the railway brotherhoods, have put in countless and tireless hours of hard work in what all Chicago expects to be the loyalty parade "heard the world around".

A quarter of a million Americans—just ordinary folks on the Saturday half-holiday or laying off from work—marching in family groups, mothers and fathers arm in arm with their children, marching for loyalty to God, to fellow man, to country, and to the principles of a free and peaceful world cannot fail to have a profound influence in tempering the thoughts of those who had been misled into believing that America had lost the virtue of loyalty and so was ripe for picking.

PROVIDING PAYMENT TO BENEFICIARIES OF FOREST SERVICE EMPLOYEES KILLED WHILE COMBATING FOREST FIRES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a copy of a bill which I introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for a lump-sum payment to the beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires.

Thirteen forest-fire fighters in Montana lost their lives last August in the Mann Gulch Fire, Helena National Forest. Since that time I have had a personal conference with Mr. William McCauley, Director of the Bureau of Employees Compensation, and I have also been in contact with the Forest Service to see what could be done to alleviate the situation which has arisen in certain instances because of this tragedy. It is

my understanding that a dependent widow of a smoke jumper gets a payment of \$1,400 per year, and a dependent widow with one child receives a payment of \$1,700 per year. I am interested in seeing to it that the parents of these boys, if this is at all possible, will be given every consideration as well. At the present time if the parents are not dependent, they are not eligible to receive payments. I am very much disturbed about this situation and after much effort and results, I have been able to compile the necessary facts by means of which a bill could be drawn up and I am today introducing this measure and urging that the committee hold hearings on it very shortly. A copy of the bill follows:

An act to provide a lump-sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 10." and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) If death results from injury incurred while combating a forest fire as an employee of the Forest Service, the United States shall pay, in addition to the payments provided under subsection (a), the sum of \$10,000 to any beneficiary designated (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of Labor) by the deceased employee, except that where (1) no beneficiary is designated by the deceased employee, (2) the designated beneficiary does not survive the deceased employee, or (3) the designated beneficiary survives such employee, but dies before receiving payment, the payment of such sum shall be made to the estate of the deceased employee."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this act to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, shall be applicable to cases of death occurring on or after January 1, 1949, and the time limitations of such act, as amended, with respect to the filing of a claim for compensation under section 10 (b) shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article and in the other to include extraneous material.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include two newspaper articles and a press release.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to the Postmaster General.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report from the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an essay in the American Legion contest.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a prize-winning essay.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include news items and editorials.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include two newspaper editorials and in the other a resolution.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in opposition to the reduction in mail service.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to the Postmaster General.

Mr. DEANE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; to include in one, two editorials, and in the second, a newspaper article.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an essay.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAGEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business in his district.

To Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, from April 25 to May 4, on account of official business.

To Mr. WHITE of California (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6553. An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1403. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a letter relative to recommending amending paragraph (2) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, to read as follows: "The rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the parity price per bushel of the commodity as of August 1, in the case of corn, and as of May 1, in the case of wheat, of the calendar year in which such crop is produced," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5628. A bill to direct the Federal Works Administrator to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island; with amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6971. A bill to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4; without amendment (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7700. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee of conference. H. R. 4080. A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of

Military Justice (Rept. No. 1946). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7073. A bill for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu; with amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Maeda; with amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7292. A bill for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita; without amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Mainke); with amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7614. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff; with amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7682. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7658. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Ito; without amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8158. A bill to repeal certain laws as they affect the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOJGLAS:

H. R. 8159. A bill to relieve distress of farm users of feed and to expand foreign markets for cereal products of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 8160. A bill to include certain lands in the Olympic National Forest, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8161. A bill to establish a Board of Education in the Federal Government and to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 8162. A bill to provide a lump-sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8163. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for the payment of insurance benefits to certain persons not within a class of permitted beneficiaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8164. A bill to ratify the organization and operations of the Island Trading Co. of Micronesia and to provide for its incorporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 8165. A bill to repeal paragraph 1752 (relating to patna rice) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8166. A bill to permit an individual who elected a joint and survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to revoke such election after the death of the spouse; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 8167. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Manchester, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8168. A bill to authorize the construction of a post office at Taneytown, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 8169. A bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8170. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8171. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 8172. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 8173. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8174. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Callahan area, Nassau County, Fla., including tributaries of the Nassau River, for flood control, drainage, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DEWART (by request):

H. R. 8175. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 8176. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned naval officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides a new basis for the apportionment of each State's membership in the House of Representatives of the United States, by ascertaining the average number of persons actually voting for certain national offices in any State during the previous 20 years and using that figure as the norm or standard of each State's representation therein, instead of making apportionments in accordance with the relationship which the total population of each State bears to the total population of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall for the purposes of the Seventeenth Decennial Census be treated as a part of Parkersburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 551. Resolution authorizing the printing of the report entitled "Unification and Strategy" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Res. 552. Resolution to authorize an investigation by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 8178. A bill for the relief of Nettie W. Capps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 8180. A bill for the relief of Parue K. Tsugami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8181. A bill for the relief of Marian Ladre and Mrs. Illaria Obidenna Ladre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 8182. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8183. A bill for the relief of Asako Tsuchida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 8184. A bill for the relief of Michiko Takada and her minor daughter, Michiko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2085. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolution adopted by the board of directors, Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning Congress for the maximum continuation of the present satisfactory program under the control and direction of the Joint United States-Mexico Commission for the eradication of the Mexican foot-and-mouth epidemic until its total eradication can be officially certified; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2086. Also, resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Moorhead, Minn., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of medicine dominated by politics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2087. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Stanley J. Witkowski, office of the city clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., urging passage of Senate bill 2166, Eighty-first Congress, to the Committee on Agriculture.

2088. Also, petition of Herman Pressler, president, Houston Bar Association, Houston, Tex., urging defeat of House bills 7550 and 7585; to the Committee on the Judiciary.